

# THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

OXFORD  
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS  
LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE

Price 19s. 6d. net. Yearly subscription 42s. net, post free. Combined yearly subscription  
for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 74s. net, post free

## THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

*Editors* C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2  
HUGH TREDENNICK, M.A., Royal Holloway College,  
Englefield Green, Surrey

*All communications intended for the Editors should be sent to Mr. Fordyce. Books for review should be sent to the Editors, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford.*

### BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Professor E. H. Warmington, M.A. (Chairman)	}	Representing the Council of the Classical Association
Professor R. G. Austin, M.A., D.Litt. (Hon. Treas.)		
F. H. Sandbach, M.A.		
Professor F. W. Walbank, M.A., F.B.A.		
Professor W. S. Watt, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)		
A. G. Woodhead, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society		
G. W. Williams, M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society		

*With the co-operation of*

Professor B. D. Meritt, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton,  
Professor J. A. FitzHerbert, University of Adelaide, and  
Professor Homer A. Thompson, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

*New Series*

*Volume XI, No. 2*

*June 1961*

## CONTENTS

Two Passages in Plato's <i>Laws</i>	T. J. SAUNDERS 101
véos (γέρον) ὥστε with infinitive	P. T. STEVENS 102
Propertiana	W. A. CAMPS 104
On Valerius Flaccus	E. COURTNEY 106
Aeschylus, <i>Persae</i> 829	B. H. I. H. STEWART 107
Cicero, <i>Pro Cluentio</i> 76	E. BADIAN 107
Cicero, <i>Tusculan Disputations</i> v.14	P. G. WALSH 108

### REVIEWS:

*Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien* (Erbse), J. A. DAVISON, 109; *Pindare au Banquet* (van Groningen), D. S. ROBERTSON, 111; *Sophocles, Trachiniae* (Kamerbeek), P. T. STEVENS, 115; *Der epirrhematische Agon bei Aristophanes* (Gelzer), D. MERVYN JONES, 118; *Tzetzes Commentarii in Aristophanem*, I (Maass Positano, Holwerda, Koster), D. MERVYN JONES, 120; *Thukydides, Geschichte* (Landmann), H. D. WESTLAKE, 121; *The Geographical Fragments of Hipparchus* (Dicks), I. BULMERTHOMAS, 123; *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Pfeiffer) H. LLOYD-JONES, 125; *Merit and Responsibility* (Adkins), R. S. BLUCK, 127; *Il problema del testo e della composizione del De Rerum Natura di Lucrezio* (Pizzani), A. F. WELLS, 128; *Vergilii Aeneidos liber 6* (Williams), W. A. CAMPS, 131; *Lucani liber vii* (Dilke-Postgate), E. J. KENNEY, 133; *César, Memorias de la Guerra Civil*, I (Bigorra), J. H. SIMON, 134; *Cicéron, Philippiques i-iv* (Boulanger, Willeumier), R. G. M. NEBET, 135; *Recherches sur la tradition manuscrite de Vitruve* (Ruffel, Soubiran), R. BROWNING, 137; *Gai Institutionum Commentarii*, 2 Lief. (David, Nelson), R. BROWNING, 138; *Textstufen klassischer Juristen* (Wieacker), J. A. C. THOMAS, 140; *Secondo Contributo alla Storia*

[continued on p. 3 of cover]

# HELLENIC TRAVELLERS CLUB

## 1961 Hellenic Cruises

Under the patronage of the Vice-Chancellors of  
Oxford, Cambridge, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Reading Universities

**Cruise No. 22. 31 March to 16 April 1961**

### YUGOSLAVIA, GREECE, TURKEY

VENICE, DUBROVNIK, DELPHI, MISTRA, SPARTA, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, SANTORINI, DELOS, VOLOS, THE METEORA, CAPE HELLES, GALLIOLI PENINSULA, TROY, THE BOSPHORUS, ISTANBUL, PERGAMUM, EPHEBUS or PRIENE, PATMOS, KNOSSOS, MALLIA or GORTYNA and PHAESTOS, OLYMPIA, KORCULA, VENICE.

**Cruise No. 23. 15 April to 1 May 1961**

### YUGOSLAVIA, GREECE, TURKEY, LEBANON, CYPRUS

VENICE, DUBROVNIK, PYLOS, KNOSSOS, ANTALYA, PERGE, ASPENDOS, BEIRUT, BYBLOS, KRAK DES CHEVALIERS, BAALBEK (Optional 2-day Air Excursions to either DAMASCUS and PALMYRA; or BETHLEHEM and JERUSALEM; or PETRA), FAMAGUSTA, SALAMIS, NICOSIA, ST. HILARION, BELLAPAI, KYRENIA, RHODES, KAMIROS, DELOS, MYKONOS, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, OLYMPIA, KORCULA, VENICE.

**Cruise No. 24. 30 April to 16 May 1961**

### YUGOSLAVIA, GREECE, TURKEY

VENICE, DUBROVNIK, OLYMPIA, KNOSSOS, ANTALYA, PERGE, ASPENDOS, SIDE, RHODES, LINDOS or PHILERIMOS and KAMIROS, EPHEBUS or PRIENE, PATMOS, CAPE HELLES, GALLIOLI PENINSULA, TROY, THE BOSPHORUS, ISTANBUL, DELOS, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, NAUPLION, MYCENAE, EPIDAUROS, TIRYNS, DELPHI, VENICE.

**Cruise No. 25. 8 August to 24 August 1961**

### YUGOSLAVIA, GREECE, TURKEY

VENICE, KORCULA, OLYMPIA, OLD CORINTH, MYCENAE, TIRYNS, EPIDAUROS, KNOSSOS, MALLIA or GORTYNA and PHAESTOS, RHODES, LINDOS or PHILERIMOS and KAMIROS, EPHEBUS, PATMOS, CAPE HELLES, GALLIOLI PENINSULA, TROY, THE BOSPHORUS, ISTANBUL, SAMOTHRACI, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, DELOS, MYKONOS, DELPHI, DUBROVNIK, VENICE.

**Cruise No. 26. 23 August to 8 September 1961**

### GREECE, TURKEY, LEBANON

VENICE, DELPHI, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, DELOS, PAROS, RHODES, LINDOS or PHILERIMOS and KAMIROS, ANTALYA, PERGE, ASPENDOS, BEIRUT, BYBLOS, BAALBEK (Optional 2-day Air Excursion to BETHLEHEM and JERUSALEM; Optional 2-day Air Excursion to DAMASCUS), MALLIA, KNOSSOS, OLYMPIA, DUBROVNIK, VENICE.

**Cruise No. 27. 7 September to 23 September 1961**

### GREECE, EGYPT, YUGOSLAVIA

VENICE, DELPHI, DELOS, MYKONOS, RHODES, ALEXANDRIA, CAIRO, GIZA, MEMPHIS, SAKKARAH (Optional 2-day Excursion to LUXOR, KARNAK, and THEBES), KNOSSOS, MALLIA or GORTYNA and PHAESTOS, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, OLYMPIA, DUBROVNIK, VENICE.

Each Cruise will be accompanied by four or five Guest Lecturers who will give Lectures on Board and at the various Sites visited.

### Guest Lecturers accompanying Cruises include

Sir Maurice Bowra, Mr. R. W. Hamilton, Mr. N. G. L. Hammond, Mr. Michael MacLagan, Canon Guy Pentreath, Mr. Stewart Perowne, Professor W. B. Stanford, The Rev. Lawrence Waddy, Mr. J. B. Ward Perkins, Sir Mortimer Wheeler, Sir John Wolfenden, Mr. T. S. R. Boase, and Mr. J. C. Dancy.

### PRICES FROM 95 GUINEAS

INCLUDING TRAVEL LONDON-VENICE AND RETURN

*For full particulars and reservations apply to*

**W. F. & R. K. SWAN (Hellenic) LTD.**

**260 (K100) Tottenham Court Road, London, W. 1**

Telephone: MUSeum 8070 (15 lines)

## THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

*Editors* C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2  
HUGH TREDENNICK, M.A., Royal Holloway College,  
Englefield Green, Surrey

*All communications intended for the Editors should be sent to Mr. Fordyce. Books for review should be sent to the Editors, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford.*

### BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Professor E. H. Warmington, M.A. (Chairman)	}	Representing the Council of the Classical Association
Professor R. G. Austin, M.A., D.Litt. (Hon. Treas.)		
F. H. Sandbach, M.A.		
Professor F. W. Walbank, M.A., F.B.A.		
Professor W. S. Watt, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)		
A. G. Woodhead, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society		
G. W. Williams, M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society		

*With the co-operation of*

Professor B. D. Meritt, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton,  
Professor J. A. FitzHerbert, University of Adelaide, and  
Professor Homer A. Thompson, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

*New Series*

*Volume XI, No. 2*

*June 1961*

## CONTENTS

Two Passages in Plato's <i>Laws</i>	T. J. SAUNDERS 101
πός (γέπου) ὥστε with infinitive	P. T. STEVENS 102
Propertiana	W. A. CAMPS 104
On Valerius Flaccus	E. COURTNEY 106
Aeschylus, <i>Persae</i> 829	B. H. I. H. STEWART 107
Cicero, <i>Pro Cluentio</i> 76	E. BADIAN 107
Cicero, <i>Tusculan Disputations</i> v.14	P. G. WALSH 108

### REVIEWS:

*Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien* (Erbse), J. A. DAVISON, 109; *Pindare au Banquet* (van Groningen), D. S. ROBERTSON, 111; *Sophocles, Trachiniae* (Kamerbeek), P. T. STEVENS, 115; *Der epirrhematische Agon bei Aristophanes* (Gelzer), D. MERVYN JONES, 118; *Tzetzes Commentarii in Aristophanem*, I (Massa Positano, Holwerda, Koster), D. MERVYN JONES, 120; *Thukydides, Geschichte* (Landmann), H. D. WESTLAKE, 121; *The Geographical Fragments of Hipparchus* (Dicks), I. BULMER-THOMAS, 123; *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Pfeiffer) H. LLOYD-JONES, 125; *Merit and Responsibility* (Adkins), R. E. BLUCK, 127; *Il problema del testo e della composizione del De Rerum Natura di Lucrezio* (Pizzani), A. F. WELLS, 128; *Vergilii Aeneidos liber 9* (Williams), W. A. CAMPS, 131; *Lucani liber vii* (Dilke-Postgate), E. J. KENNEY, 133; *César, Mémoires de la Guerre Civile*, I (Bigorra), J. H. SIMON, 134; *Cicéron, Philippiques i-iv* (Boulangier, Wulleumier), R. G. M. NEDDEY, 135; *Recherches sur la tradition manuscrite de Vitruve* (Ruffel, Soubiran), R. BROWNENG, 137; *Gai Institutionum Commentarii*, 2 Lief. (David, Nelson), R. BROWNING, 138; *Textstufen klassischer Juristen* (Wiener), J. A. C. THOMAS, 140; *Secondo Contributo alla Storia*

[continued on p. 9 of cover]



# HELLENIC TRAVELLERS CLUB

## 1961 Hellenic Cruises

Under the patronage of the Vice-Chancellors of  
Oxford, Cambridge, Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Reading Universities

### Cruise No. 22. 31 March to 16 April 1961

#### YUGOSLAVIA, GREECE, TURKEY

VENICE, DUBROVNIK, DELPHI, MISTRA, SPARTA, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, SANTORINI, DELOS, VOLOS, THE METEORA, CAPE HELLES, GALLIOLI PENINSULA, TROY, THE BOSPHORUS, ISTANBUL, PERGAMUM, EPHEBUS or PRIENE, FATMOS, KNOSSOS, MALLIA or GORTYNA and PHAESTOS, OLYMPIA, KORCULA, VENICE.

### Cruise No. 23. 15 April to 1 May 1961

#### YUGOSLAVIA, GREECE, TURKEY, LEBANON, CYPRUS

VENICE, DUBROVNIK, PYLOS, KNOSSOS, ANTALYA, PERGE, ASPENDOS, BEIRUT, BYBLOS, KRAK DES CHEVALIERS, BAALBEK (Optional 2-day Air Excursions to either DAMASCUS and PALMYRA; or BETHLEHEM and JERUSALEM; or PETRA), FAMAGUSTA, SALAMIS, NICOSIA, ST. HILARION, BELLAPAI, KYRENIA, RHODES, KAMIROS, DELOS, MYKONOS, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, OLYMPIA, KORCULA, VENICE.

### Cruise No. 24. 30 April to 16 May 1961

#### YUGOSLAVIA, GREECE, TURKEY

VENICE, DUBROVNIK, OLYMPIA, KNOSSOS, ANTALYA, PERGE, ASPENDOS, SIDE, RHODES, LINDOS or PHILERIMOS and KAMIROS, EPHEBUS or PRIENE, FATMOS, CAPE HELLES, GALLIOLI PENINSULA, TROY, THE BOSPHORUS, ISTANBUL, DELOS, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, NAUPLION, MYCENAE, EPIDAUROS, TIRYNS, DELPHI, VENICE.

### Cruise No. 25. 8 August to 24 August 1961

#### YUGOSLAVIA, GREECE, TURKEY

VENICE, KORCULA, OLYMPIA, OLD CORINTH, MYCENAE, TIRYNS, EPIDAUROS, KNOSSOS, MALLIA or GORTYNA and PHAESTOS, RHODES, LINDOS or PHILERIMOS and KAMIROS, EPHEBUS, FATMOS, CAPE HELLES, GALLIOLI PENINSULA, TROY, THE BOSPHORUS, ISTANBUL, SAMOTHRAKI, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, DELOS, MYKONOS, DELPHI, DUBROVNIK, VENICE.

### Cruise No. 26. 23 August to 8 September 1961

#### GREECE, TURKEY, LEBANON

VENICE, DELPHI, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, DELOS, PAROS, RHODES, LINDOS or PHILERIMOS and KAMIROS, ANTALYA, PERGE, ASPENDOS, BEIRUT, BYBLOS, BAALBEK (Optional 2-day Air Excursion to BETHLEHEM and JERUSALEM; Optional 2-day Air Excursion to DAMASCUS), MALLIA, KNOSSOS, OLYMPIA, DUBROVNIK, VENICE.

### Cruise No. 27. 7 September to 23 September 1961

#### GREECE, EGYPT, YUGOSLAVIA

VENICE, DELPHI, DELOS, MYKONOS, RHODES, ALEXANDRIA, CAIRO, GIZA, MEMPHIS, SAKKARAH (Optional 2-day Excursion to LUXOR, KARNAK, and THEBES), KNOSSOS, MALLIA or GORTYNA and PHAESTOS, ATHENS, DAPHNI and ELEUSIS or SOUNION, OLYMPIA, DUBROVNIK, VENICE.

Each Cruise will be accompanied by four or five Guest Lecturers who will give Lectures on Board and at the various Sites visited.

#### Guest Lecturers accompanying Cruises include

Sir Maurice Bowra, Mr. R. W. Hamilton, Mr. N. G. L. Hammond, Mr. Michael Macgregor, Canon Guy Pentyreath, Mr. Stewart Perowne, Professor W. B. Stanford, The Rev. Lawrence Waddy, Mr. J. B. Ward Perkins, Sir Mortimer Wheeler, Sir John Wolfenden, Mr. T. S. R. Boase, and Mr. J. C. Dancy.

### PRICES FROM 95 GUINEAS

INCLUDING TRAVEL LONDON-VENICE AND RETURN

For full particulars and reservations apply to

**W. F. & R. K. SWAN (Hellenic) LTD.**

260 (K100) Tottenham Court Road, London, W. 1

Telephone: MUSeum 8070 (15 lines)



## The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

†T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D. †W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

†E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.

L. A. POST, L.H.D. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A., F.R.HIST.SOC.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

*Each volume Foolscap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 18s. net*

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

"We shall never be independent of our Loeb."—*Times Literary Supplement*.

### NEW VOLUMES, 1961

#### GREEK

391 ARISTOTLE *Posterior Analytics and Topics*. Translated by H. Tredennick and E. S. Forster.

425 PLUTARCH *Moralia*. Fifteen volumes, Vol. IX. Translated by W. C. Helmbold, E. L. Minar, Jr., and F. H. Sandbach.

431 LUCIAN Eight volumes, Vol. VII. Translated by M. D. Macleod.

379 PHILO Ten volumes, Vol. X. Translated by F. El. Colson; Index by the Rev. J. W. Earp.

#### LATIN

419 PLINY Ten volumes, Vol. X. Translated by D. E. Eichholtz.

William Heinemann, Ltd., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

*Books on*

## CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY

Byzantium, the Early Church, the  
Middle Ages and the Renaissance

British and Foreign Works of  
Scholarship, New and Secondhand;  
books bought, catalogues issued

**W. HEFFER & SONS LTD**

3-4 Petty Cury, Cambridge

Telephone 58351

# The Classical Review

NEW SERIES VOLUME XI NO. 2

(VOLUME LXXV OF THE CONTINUOUS SERIES)

June 1961

---

## TWO PASSAGES IN PLATO'S LAWS

- (1) 794 a-c: συνιέναι δὲ εἰς τὰ κατὰ κώμας ἱερὰ δεῖ πάντα ἤδη τὰ τηλικαῦτα παιδιά, ἀπὸ τριετοῦς μέχρι τῶν ἑξ ἐτῶν, κοινῇ τὰ τῶν καιμητῶν εἰς ταῦτόν ἕκαστα. . . ἢ δὲ καταστῆσαι ἀρχέτω φοιτῶσα εἰς τὸν ἱερὸν ἑκάστης ἡμέρας καὶ κολάζουσα αἰεὶ τὸν ἀδικοῦντα, δοῦλον μὲν καὶ δούλην καὶ ξένον καὶ ξένην αὐτῇ διὰ τινων τῆς πόλεως οἰκετῶν, πολίτην δὲ ἀμφισβητοῦντα μὲν τῇ κολάσει πρὸς τοὺς ἀστυνόμους ἐπὶ δίκην ἀγούσα, ἀναμφισβήτητον δὲ ὄντα καὶ τὸν πολίτην αὐτῇ κολαζέτω.

G. R. MORROW (*Plato's Law of Slavery in its Relation to Greek Law* [Urbana, 1939], p. 44) remarks: '... slave children are to be educated along with free children, up to the age of six at least'. He presumably relies on the words πάντα ἤδη τὰ παιδιά and the mention of δοῦλον καὶ δούλην. If he is right, we must surely, because of the ξένον καὶ ξένην, include metic children also; further, since there is no indication at any point in what follows that recipients of instruction after the age of six have their numbers reduced in any way, we are led to the astonishing conclusion that the entire Magnesian educational system is meant to apply to the children of metics and slaves as well as to the children of citizens.

The special character of the education enjoyed by the Magnesian citizens is enough to put this conclusion right out of court (see e.g. 841 e, 942 a). But there seems no need to get into such difficulties: the Greek has a much more natural and satisfactory meaning. The words πάντα . . . κτλ. do not *have* to have any greater meaning than 'all citizen children', who seem to be the main object of Plato's attention in his other discussions of education in the *Laws*. There is no hint that the words refer to slave children also. As for δοῦλον καὶ δούλην καὶ ξένον καὶ ξένην, it seems perfectly clear that this refers not to children but to adults. The female magistrate will punish slaves and foreigners summarily (αὐτῇ), but a citizen is entitled to a trial before the city stewards if he wishes to contest the punishment. Now surely if δοῦλον . . . κτλ. refers to children, so must πολίτην too. A child would almost certainly not take kindly to punishment—is he to be entitled to a trial, at the age of six at most? This is ridiculous. The reference must be entirely to adults. Presumably they would be idle persons making a nuisance of themselves near the schools—possibly parents. Whoever they are, this passage gives no handle at all to the suggestion that metic children, let alone slave children, are educated on the same footing as the children of the Magnesian citizens.

(a) 848 a: ... πάντων τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἀπονεμηθὲν τρίτον μέρος ὧν αὖ ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἔστω τοῦτο μόνον, τῶν δὲ δύο μερῶν μηδὲν ἐπανάγκες ἔστω πωλεῖν.

The somewhat ponderous play on words has been missed by commentators and translators. Plato has just explained that the food-supply of Magnesia is to be divided into three parts: the first for the citizens and their families, the second for their slaves, and the third for the craftsmen and foreigners in general. C. Ritter (*Platons Gesetze, Kommentar* [Leipzig, 1896], pp. 265 n. and 266) thought that μηδὲν ἐπανάγκες ἔστω πωλεῖν amounted to 'it is necessary that none should be sold' (i.e. ἐπανάγκες ἔστω μηδὲν πωλεῖν). E. B. England (*The Laws of Plato* [Manchester, 1921], on 848 a 7), remarks: 'The analogy of *Symposium* 176 e 5' [πῖνευ ὅσον ἂν ἕκαστος βούληται, ἐπανάγκες δὲ μηδὲν εἶναι] 'compels us to translate "there must be no compulsion to sell anything . . . only this (third) part can be forced on the market".' This must imply that the other two parts, for the citizens and their slaves, could conceivably be sold under certain circumstances, but that in this case there can be no compulsion.

But what circumstances? Is it not nonsensical to suppose that food destined for a man's family and slaves could be sold by the one and bought by the other? Money has a very restricted use in the *Laws*, being intended mainly for dealings with artisans (742 a: the slaves here must be public slaves, not household slaves). The sense that Ritter gives the passage must be the correct one, though we should probably try to translate it slightly differently so as to harmonize with the *Symposium* passage. ἀναγκαίων: ἀνάγκης: ἐπανάγκες suggest that Plato is playing on words and that the prohibition μηδὲν ἐπανάγκες ἔστω πωλεῖν is understated. I suggest by way of translation: 'Let this third share of all the necessities of life be the only one that must of necessity be sold—let there be no necessity to sell any part of the other two shares.' The notion of ἀνάγκη is frequently used by Plato to denote something forced on the legislator by circumstances (e.g. 742 a, 920 b); μηδὲν ἐπανάγκες ἔστω πωλεῖν then says only what is strictly true, that the economic organization of Magnesia should preclude any need to sell the first two shares of the food-supply; circumstances demand that only one part should go on the market—that destined for craftsmen and foreigners in general.

Bedford College, London

TREVOR J. SAUNDERS

### νέος (γέρων) ὥστε WITH INFINITIVE

THE use of a comparative adjective or adverb followed by ἢ ὥστε with an infinitive, e.g. νεώτερός ἐστιν ἢ ὥστε ἐπίστασθαι 'he is too young to understand', is familiar. It also seems to be the established doctrine that a positive adjective which denotes weakness or deficiency and is followed by ὥστε with the infinitive has the same force, so that νέος ἐστιν ὥστε ἐπίστασθαι also means 'he is too young to understand'. See Kühner-Gerth, *Gr. Gramm.* i, 503 Anm. 2; Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses*, § 588; L. & S.<sup>9</sup> s.v. ὥστε B I. 2; Schwyzler, *Gr. Gramm.* ii. 678, 3. The purpose of this note is to question that view and to suggest that where the positive adjective is used the speaker indicates a deficiency in respect of an action but does not necessarily imply that the action could not or cannot therefore be performed at all.

Three examples are cited in the above works of reference:

1. Eur. *An.* 80 γέρων ἐκεῖνος ὥστε σ' ὠφέλειν παρὰν. In this line the slave woman is answering Andromache's question whether there is any news of the



coming of Peleus. Most modern editors (Wecklein, Kamerbeek, Bassi) take the meaning to be 'too old to help'; but the explanation of the scholiast τὸ γῆρας αὐτὸν ἐμποδίζει ὥστε τάχως ἔλθειν καὶ βοηθῆσαι suggests that his age will slow him down rather than make his coming to their aid impossible and this sense suits the context better. If his ability either to come or to help if present had already been ruled out by the slave, it seems unlikely that the following lines of dialogue (81-87) would have ignored this and proceeded on the assumption that the main difficulty was to convey to Peleus a message of appeal. Méridier, rightly I think, translates 'Il est bien vieux pour te venir en aide'.

2. Plato, *Prot.* 314 b ταῦτα οὖν σκοπώμεθα καὶ μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἡμῶν. ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐτι νέοι ὥστε τοσοῦτον πρᾶγμα διελέσθαι. Here the sense may well be 'we should be glad of the help of older men, since our youth is a handicap, though not necessarily a fatal handicap'. Heindorf, quoted by Adam, observed on this passage that whereas νεώτεροι ἢ ὥστε would deny altogether ἢ τοῦ διελέσθαι δύναμις, the words νέοι ὥστε are less strong: 'nobis nonnisi iuvenalis quaedam facultas suppetit ad tantam rem diiudicandam.'

3. Xen. *Mem.* iii. 13. 3 ἀλλὰ ψυχρόν, ἔφη, ἐστὶν ὥστε λούσασθαι. To someone who complained ὅτι θερμὸν εἶη παρ' ἑαυτῷ τὸ ὕδωρ δὲ πῖνοι, Socrates says 'Well, when you want to wash in warm water, it will be ready for you', and the reply is 'but it's cold for washing'. The whole context suggests that the water is warmer than he likes for drinking and cooler than he likes for washing, but not that he is thereby prevented from using it for either purpose. This is confirmed later in the same section, where in Socrates' question πότερον λούσασθαι ψυχρότερον τὸ παρὰ σοὶ ἢ τὸ ἐν Ἀμφιαράου; the sense is clearly 'which of the two waters is colder for washing?' or 'when you wash in it?'.

To these examples may be added Antiphon v. 79 γέρων μὲν ἐκεῖνος ὥστ' ἐμοὶ βοηθεῖν, νεώτερος δ' ἐγὼ πολλῷ ἢ ὥστε δύνασθαι ἐμαντῷ τιμωρεῖν ἱκανῶς. Here the orator distinguishes between a difficulty and a fatal obstacle: 'My father is an old man, and it is hard to expect him to come forward, and I myself am far too young to defend myself properly.'

Adjectives of this type may also of course be followed by an infinitive without ὥστε and here too it seems to be assumed that there is no distinction between positive and comparative; see K.-G. i. 10-11. I believe, however, that the same distinction is valid. Thus in Homer *Il.* xxiv 368 γέρων δέ τοι οὗτος ὀπηδεῖ / ἄνδρ' ἀπαμύνεσθαι the sense is not precisely 'zu schwach, um . . .' but 'his age will tell against him when it comes to defending you'. Again in Plato, *Rep.* 556 b μαλακοὺς δὲ καρτερεῖν πρὸς ἡδονὰς τε καὶ λύπας the sense is not 'too weak to resist at all' but 'weak in their resistance to pleasures and pains'.

My conclusion is that whereas a comparative adjective or adverb followed by ἢ ὥστε (or in verse ἢ without ὥστε) and an infinitive denies the possibility of the action denoted by the verb, a positive adjective denoting weakness or deficiency followed by an infinitive, with or without ὥστε, does not altogether deny the possibility of the action, but indicates an obstacle without making it clear whether the speaker regards it as fatal or not. In some contexts the difference would admittedly not be very great, and the Greek tendency to under-statement may have led to the occasional use of the less emphatic form where the more emphatic might have been expected; but this does not mean that there was no awareness of any distinction.

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW  
PROPERTIANA

## (1) iv. 4. 3-8:

lucus erat felix hederoso conditus antro,  
multaque nativis obstrepit arbor aquis,  
Silvani ramosa domus, quo dulcis ab aestu  
fistula poturas ire iubebat ovis.  
hunc Tatus fontem vallo praecingit acerno  
fidaque suggesta castra coronat humo.

THE poet is here setting the scene for the story of Tarpeia. We learn later that she comes to draw water at the spring which the *lucus* here described contains, and while thus engaged sees Tatus exercising on horseback and falls in love with him.

It is clear that something is wrong with line 7, for it says that Tatus placed his palisade so as wholly or partly to surround the spring, and this is incompatible with what is to happen later on.

The conclusion suggests itself that Propertius wrote *hunc Tatus contra* (or *propter*; cf. Liv. ix. 2 *castra propter aquam vallo circumdant*) . . . , i.e. Tatus fortified his camp over against the *lucus*. We have then to wait till *fida* . . . *castra* in the following line for an object to *praecingit*, the construction being ἀπὸ κοινοῦ on the model of Prop. ii. 20. 19 *quod si nec nomen nec me tua forma teneret*. This circumstance would in itself favour the corruption of *contra* (or *propter*) to provide an accusative for *praecingit* (as well as a substantive for *hunc*). With a preposition restored the couplet will read

hunc Tatus contra [*sive propter*] vallo praecingit acerno  
fidaque suggesta castra coronat humo.

## (2) iv. 7. 35-38:

Lygdamus uratur! candescat lamina vernae!  
sensi ego cum insidiis pallida vina bibi.  
ut Nomas arcanas tollat versuta salivas,  
dicet damnatas ignea testa manus.

37 ut Rossberg cum dett., teste Smyth; aut O; at V<sub>4</sub>

The text here is printed in a form which I suggest deserves renewed consideration. Cynthia's ghost, alleging that she has been poisoned, demands that certain slaves should be tortured, either as witnesses or as accomplices. It is difficult to make sense of the *aut* of the manuscripts in line 37, but reading *ut* instead we get good sense: 'Though artful Nomas hide away those secret poisons, the glowing sherd will soon make her confess whose hands are guilty.' The emendation *ut* is not recorded in the latest Oxford and Teubner editions. I owe the attribution of it to the kindness of Mr. W. R. Smyth.

## (3) iv. 7. 55-62:

nam gemina est sedes turpem sortita per amnem,  
turbaque diversa remigat omnis aqua.  
una Clytaemestrae stuprum vehit altera Cressae  
portat mentitae lignea monstra bovis.  
ecce coronato pars altera rapta phaselo  
mulcet ubi Elysias aura beata rosas,  
qua numerosa fides quaque aera rotunda Cybebes  
mitratique sonant Lydia plectra choris.

57 una O; unda Hertzberg; cumba Rossberg

58 bovis O; ratis Palmer

The problem is in line 57 above. The text printed is that of the manuscript tradition (modified in lines 59 and 61 by conjectures of Palmer and Turnebus which are reasonably certain and in any case need not now concern us).

The speaker is Cynthia's ghost. She says (lines 55-56) that in the world below the virtuous and the wicked have two separate (*gemina*, line 55) abodes allotted to them and that these are served by separate ferries across the infernal river. Both this context and the occurrence of *altera* in line 59 show that Clytemnestra and Pasiphae in lines 57-58 must be grouped, not contrasted, and that therefore in line 57 either *una* or *altera* must be wrong.

Some change *una*, reading *unda* or *cumba* instead. But we then feel the lack of a copulative conjunction between the sentence relating to Clytemnestra and that relating to Pasiphae. Because of the need for such a conjunction it seems much more probable that the error in the received text lies in *altera*.

An easy substitute for *altera* would seem to be *aut ea*. For the 'redundant' demonstrative cf. other examples (of the type *et is* and *isque*) in Kühner-Stegmann (1914), ii (2), 564-5. It is in fact not wholly redundant here, because it prepares for the second verb *portat*, itself similarly 'redundant' after *vehit* in the previous line. This combination of *vehit* with *portat*, which might otherwise excite suspicion, is itself defended by the parallel *vehit . . . portans* in iv. 1. 46-47.

With *una* at the beginning of line 57 will have to be supplied *turba* or *aqua* or the idea of *ratis* or the like; the meaning in any case is 'one of the two ferries'. The passage as emended will read:

nam gemina est sedes turpem sortita per amnem,  
turbaeque diversa remigat omnis aqua.  
una Clytaemestrae stuprum vehit, aut ea Cressae  
portat mentitae lignea monstra bovis.  
ecce coronato pars altera rapta phaselo  
mulcet ubi Elysias aura beata rosas . . .

(4) iv. 11. 19-20:

aut si quis posita iudex sedet Aeacus urna,  
in mea sortita iudicet ossa pila.  
20 iudicet LPDVVoμ; vindicet F

The speaker proclaims her readiness to stand trial in the world below, confident in the innocence of her life.

The repetition *iudex/iudicet* in a sentence of this form is obviously improbable, and most editions print *vindicet* in line 20.

But *vindicare in aliquem* could hardly mean anything but 'punish' or 'take vengeance on'. And Cornelia (the speaker) cannot possibly be saying that she is willing to be punished; she is willing to be tried, because she knows she is innocent.

Hence we should surely leave *iudicet* (intransitive as in Hor. *Odes* ii. 13. 22 *iudicantem vidimus Aeacum*; with *in* as at Cic. *Cluent.* 105 *sedissentne iudices in C. Fabricium*) in line 20 and read *vindex* (cf. Cat. lxiv. 192-3 *facta virum muliantes vindice poena Eumenides*; also Hor. *Odes* iv. 9. 37 and 41) in line 19. Cornelia may well say that if indeed an Aeacus holds court in the world below to punish sinners, she, being innocent, is not afraid to be tried by him.

If the couplet is thus emended, it will read:

aut si quis posita vindex sedet Aeacus urna,  
in mea sortita iudicet ossa pila.

## (5) iv. 11. 51-54:

vel tu, quae tardam movisti fune Cybeben,  
 Claudia, turritae rara ministra deae;  
 vel cuius iasos (sive cuius rasos) cum Vesta reposceret ignes  
 exhibuit vivos carbasus alba focos.

53 cuius iasos  $\mu\nu$  (? representing N, which is here not available); cuius rasos FLPDVVo;  
 cuius, sacros Rossberg

The problem is in line 53, where the italicized portion is evidently corrupt. Various conjectures have been made to remove the corruption: *cuius sacros*, *cuius stratos*, *cui iuratos*, and others.

The speaker is a Roman matron, recently dead and imagined as delivering an apologia on her own behalf. She quotes for illustration of her virtue certain Vestal Virgins, celebrated in legend, whose chastity had been questioned but sensationally vindicated. The second of these (lines 53-54) is the Aemilia about whom we read in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (ii. 68). The sacred fire went out. Aemilia on account of this was suspected of unchastity. Protesting her innocence she prayed to Vesta to justify her, and, tearing off a piece of her garment, threw it on the hearth. The fire blazed up.

The simplest correction in line 53 (simpler even than Rossberg's *cuius*, *sacros*) would seem to be *cui, iusta suos*. Vesta can well be called *iusta* here, because she both properly complains of the dereliction and properly sees justice done to her priestess. The couplet will then read:

vel cui, iusta suos cum Vesta reposceret ignes,  
 exhibuit vivos carbasus alba focos.

Pembroke College, Cambridge

W. A. CAMPS

ON VALERIUS FLACCUS<sup>1</sup>

## ii. 519:

intremere Ide  
 inlidique rates pronaque resurgere turre.

THE apparatus to this much-vexed sentence is a melancholy sight, and the mere enumeration of the conjectures would be a harsh criticism of their authors. They err because they strike out blindly without first trying to identify the enemy. One word and only one is corrupt, and that is *resurgere*. Apart from that, diction, construction (it appears to be necessary to say that it is that of the historic infinitive), and sense are perfect, and are confirmed by Claudian, *Rapt. Pros.* ii. 152 (I have this reference written in my margin, but whether it is due to myself or derived from someone else I cannot now say):

confligere turre  
 pronaque vibratis radicibus oppida verti.

Read therefore *recumbere*, which I had thought of before I found that it had been proposed by F. Reuss, *Philol.* lviii (1899), 430.

## ii. 593:

te quoque ab Haemoniis ignota per aequora terris  
 regna infesta domus fatisque simillima nostris  
 fata ferunt.

<sup>1</sup> My thanks for valuable comments are due to Professor W. S. Maguinness.



I do not know anything to be added to what can be learnt from Langen about Valerius' practice in the postponement of *-que*, which is generally assumed here. In i. 49 it is imported by conjecture; at i. 420 the text is quite uncertain; i. 848 is not an example; ii. 168, vii. 310 *iamque* is a special case (see Norden, *Aeneid* vi, p. 404; Housman on Manil. i. 269). Even if there were parallels it would be objectionable here, and Heinsius proposed *domo* (he himself removed the only support for this form<sup>1</sup> in poetry, Prop. iii. 6. 22, where it is part of the corruption finally cleared away by Palmer), Baehrens *domu* (which is impossible); why not simply *domi*? Markland in his unpublished notes suggested *bonis*, which seems to me slightly less appropriate.

viii. 158:

sed quid ego quemquam inmeritis incuso querellis?

This implies that the speaker will proceed either to blame herself or some circumstance external to the people involved, or pass to some topic other than blame. But in fact this is the line by which Medea's mother turns from accusation of Jason to accusation of her daughter, and what we want is something meaning 'I am blaming the wrong person'. And then there is *egō*; the cases quoted by *Thes. L. L.* v. 2. 252. 80 ff. fully deserve the sceptical comment by Heraeus. Both these faults can be eliminated by reading *quid ago, quemque* . . . This is simply a transposition of *e* and *a*; cf. Housman, *Manil.* i, p. lviii.

The unpublished notes by Markland which I have mentioned are in a copy of Burman in the Bodleian Library, C. Text. Lat. V. 10. From them I select the following: i. 637 *amplexu*; iii. 230 *virtusve* (Weichert), 233 *placet atque* (Peerlkamp), 525 *aura*; iv. 226 *tum* (Thilo); v. 529 *cum* (Langen) *semel aut*; vi. 385 *prodidit* (Gronovius); vii. 85 *luce*, 363 *sanus*, 391 *fontibus*.

King's College, University of London

E. COURTNEY

### AESCHYLUS PERSAE 829

ALMOST all collated manuscripts read for 829-31:

πρὸς ταῦτ' ἐκείνους σωφρονεῖν κεχρημένοι  
πινύσκει· εὐλόγοιςι νοθευτήμασι  
λήξαι θεοβλαβεῖνθ' ὑπερκόμψω θρόνοι.

The last two words of 829 have caused universal anxiety amongst editors; Professor Broadhead's recent commentary usefully diagnoses the points at issue. *σωφρονεῖν κεχρημένοι* may be right as it stands, though the usage is unparalleled.

Emendation has been directed equally at *σωφρονεῖν* and at *κεχρημένοι*. *κεχρημένων* (itself by no means easy to construe) is recorded as a variant in the scholia of some manu-

scripts, and was even the original reading in one. By natural assimilation of case-endings, however, it is more likely to have come from *κεχρημένοι* than vice versa.

The manuscript tradition strongly favours the *difficilior lectio κεχρημένοι*; if it stands, τῷ φρονεῖν would satisfy the grammatical need for a dative, without doing violence to the text palaeographically. In its favour, as Professor Page has pointed out to me, is the parallel Homeric formula (thrice in the *Odyssey*) φρεσὶ γὰρ κέχρητ' ἀγαθῶν, of which it might even be a conscious reminiscence.

22 Finch Lane, E.C. 3 B. H. I. H. STEWART

### CICERO, PRO CLUENTIO 76

nonnulli autem seueri homines, qui  
hoc statuerunt, quo quisque animo quid  
faceret spectari oportere, etsi alii pecunia

accepta uerum iudicabant, tamen nihilo  
minus se superioribus suis iudiciis constare  
putabant oportere; itaque damnarunt.

<sup>1</sup> I assume that he meant a locative; a dative is hardly better supported (*Flor. epist.* i. 10. 13 in a disputed reading); an ablative is tautologous.

IN *C.R.* lxxiii (1959), 200 f. Dr. Shackleton Bailey, in an assortment of emendations, includes one of this passage. In this he makes Cicero's virtuous jurymen decide 'quo quisque animo quid faceret spectari (non) oportere', concluding that 'in the vulgate Cicero . . . is made to say the contrary of what he must have meant'. Surely this sort of violent interference with a text can be considered only in a *locus desperatus*, and then only if it produces obvious sense not to be achieved by other methods. However, Dr. Shackleton Bailey's text can only mean that a man's motives must not be considered in judging his actions. And this is such outrageous doctrine that, if it *had* been in our texts, there would have been interminable argument on whether it might be thought tolerable. Since, however, it is *not* in the text, why should we foist it on those high-minded men? Dr. Shackleton Bailey softens the impact by rendering the passage, in a loose paraphrase, ' . . . decided that their colleagues' motives were not relevant'. This is a little better as far as sense goes. But it seems that, instead of translating his proposed text, he has translated something like 'quo quisque *illorum* animo *hoc* fecisset spectari non oportere'—which is very different. The particular statement, in a given exceptional

case, might be defended; but the general rule that we must not judge a man's actions by his motives would be hard to explain.

Yet the text, as it stands, makes perfect sense. The circumstances are a little complicated, we must remember. Cicero has been trying to make the rather unusual point that a few virtuous jurymen, although convinced of the guilt of the accused, voted *non liquet*, because they thought bribery had been used to secure his conviction: apparently they wanted to avoid giving anyone reason to believe that they might be concerned in it. But other virtuous men (Cicero now goes on to say) decided that their happening to vote the same way as men who had been bribed did no harm in itself: their *vote* would be the same, but their *motives* were pure (the accused's guilt being evident), and it was the motive that counted ('quo quisque animo quid faceret spectari oportere'): they were not only doing the right deed, but doing it for the right reason.

I suggest that the honest scribe, like Cassandra, should be believed when he talks sense.

E. BADIAN

*Durham Colleges, University of Durham*

## CICERO, TUSCULAN DISPUTATIONS v. 14

si enim nulla virtus prudentia vacat, prudentia ipsa hoc videt, non omnis bonos esse etiam beatos, multaque de M. Atilio, Q. Caepione, M'. Aquilio recordatur, beatamque vitam . . . conantem ire in euleum retinet ipsa prudentia negatque ei cum dolore et cruciatu quicquam esse commune.

THE argument is that the happy life must eschew grief and torture; the spokesman quotes three *exempla* of men who were good but not happy. M. Atilius Regulus was captured by the Carthaginians and (according to Roman chauvinistic sources) tortured and killed: M'. Aquilius persuaded Nico-medes to go to war, but was then captured and executed by Mithridates in 88. But what is Q. Caepio doing in this company? Shamefully defeated by the Cimbri in 103, deprived of his imperium by the people and held in disgrace, he 'does not seem to have been such a striking example of virtue struggling against misfortune as Cicero thinks' (Henry). Certain feeble explanations have been adduced for his presence in this catalogue:

'Les aristocrates soutenaient qu'il n'était pas coupable et, dans tous les cas, il était victime d'une illégalité' (Appuhn). He was 'condamné à l'exil et serait mort dans la misère' (Humbert).

The fact is that Cicero must have intended to include the name of a man who like Regulus and Aquilius was imprisoned and murdered by the enemy. Now in the war with the Cimbri in which 'ab ducibus nostris Q. Caepione et Cn. Manlio male pugnatum' (Sall. *Jug.* 114), the legate M. Aurelius Scaurus was captured and killed in captivity. He was a Scaevola-like figure: 'eo quod diceret Romanos vinci non posse, a Boiorum feroci iuvene occisus est' (Livy, *Epit.* lxxvii: cf. Dio Cass. fr. 91: Licinianus p. 11 ed. Flemisch: see Greenidge and Clay, *Sources for Roman History* (2nd ed. rev. Gray), 83).

The text is incontrovertibly sound, as the manuscript evidence shows. Cicero is here guilty of a slip of memory; he has confused hero and villain in the war with the Cimbri.

*University of Edinburgh*

P. G. WALSH

## REVIEWS

## ITVR IN ANTIQVAM SILVAM

HARTMUT ERBSE: *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien*. (Zetemata, Heft 24.) Pp. xii+444; 2 figs. Munich: Beck, 1960. Paper, DM. 38.

PROFESSOR ERBSE, who lately succeeded Professor Bruno Snell at Hamburg, has long been known<sup>1</sup> as one of the most painstaking explorers of the intellectual jungle which lies between the scholarship of the earlier Empire (the last representative of which may be taken to be Herodian) and the revival of learning which followed the defeat of the Iconoclasts and is associated with the appearance of our first Greek minuscule manuscripts in the ninth century A.D. One of the most important products of this revival is the impressive series of texts with marginal and interlinear commentaries to which, along with the various lexica and reference books, we owe almost all our knowledge of the first great age of Greek scholarship; and in this series pride of place is naturally taken by the commentaries on Homer, and especially on the *Iliad*. Erbse is engaged on a new edition of the principal ancient commentaries on the *Iliad*, i.e. those which are to be found in the two most important Venetian manuscripts (those known to textual critics of the *Iliad* as A and B), in the Townley manuscript (T), and in certain others; and the present work, together with the articles listed in the footnote, especially those in *Rheinisches Museum* and *Mnemosyne*, is to be taken as forming *Prolegomena* to this very important and much-needed publication.

The information contained in the early minuscule commentaries on Homer is of three main types: critical, dealing with textual problems; exegetical, dealing with questions of interpretation and directed specifically to the passage which they accompany; and general, including extracts from works on grammar, geography, mythology, and so on, which are indeed relevant to the passages under discussion but which were not originally composed as a commentary on those particular passages. It should also be premised that most of the information in the critical notes is derived from a compilation of works by Didymus, Aristonicus, Nicanor, and Herodian, which is known to German scholars as the *Viermännerkommentar* (abbreviated VMK). This VMK has long been known to form the groundwork of the main commentary in A (which is the only manuscript which identifies the four by name), and Erbse assumes that those who read his book will already be acquainted with the paper on the tradition of this VMK which he published in *Mnemosyne* in 1953 (his book makes some corrections to the argument of this paper, but the purpose of these is rather to improve definition than to make changes of principle). I have lingered over these preliminary points, which are bound to seem elementary to those who

<sup>1</sup> It may be helpful to list his main contributions to the subject: *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika* (Berlin, 1950; cf. D. Mervyn Jones, *C.R.*, n.s. ii [1952], 83-85), 'Die Genfer Iliasscholien' (*Rh. Mus.*, n.f. xcv [1952], 170-91), 'Bemerkungen zu Homer und zu seinen Interpreten' (*Glotta*,

xxxii [1953], 236-47), 'Homerscholien und hellenistische Glossare bei Apollonius Rhodius' (*Hermes*, lxxxi [1953], 163-96), 'Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung der Iliasscholien' (*Mnemosyne*, 4th Ser. vi [1953], 3-38).

are already acquainted with the subject, because Erbse gives very little assistance to those who have not passed this way before: he provides neither bibliography nor explanation of abbreviations nor general index; and considering that his main aim is to construct a *stemma codicum* on which to base his edition it is remarkable that there are only two small stemmatological diagrams, which do not give even an outline sketch of the tradition as a whole, and have to be combined with the *stemma* at the end of the *Mnemosyne* article of 1953. Cost of production obviously accounts for this lack of illustration; but Erbse's task in explaining, even for the experienced reader, his view of the relations of the various types of commentary (in the manuscript A, for example) to the text of the poem and to one another would have been enormously simplified by the provision of a plate or two (not everyone has ready access to Châtelain's facsimile of A, and of other important manuscripts such as B, C, and T reproductions exist in microfilm only).

The book is divided into two main sections and a 'Nachwort', and is provided with an index of passages in the Homer scholia and of Greek words. The first main section is devoted to 'Problems of the manuscript tradition', and is divided into six chapters. The first of these (pp. 3-16) deals with the tradition of the 'so-called B-Scholia' ('so-called' because B owes its eponymous position to the fact that Villoison published its scholia along with those of A in 1788; as Erbse shows, there are better witnesses to the tradition of this mainly exegetic commentary, which should be called, according to the state of the evidence at various points, 'b-', 'bT-' or 'c-Scholia'). The second chapter (17-77) discusses the relationship of Porphyrius' *Quaestiones Homericae* to the b-Scholia (in his preface Erbse explains this departure from the logical plan of his work as due to the far too close connexion which Schrader, in his edition of Porphyrius' work, established between that work and the exegetic scholia). Chapters 3 (78-122) and 4 (123-73) deal with the manuscript A: the first separates out the general matter (referred to by Erbse as 'interpolated') from the properly critical and exegetic matter in the main commentaries, and the second discusses the relations between A, the *Etymologicum Genuinum* (for his study of which Erbse was able to consult the manuscript material left by Reitzenstein and by A. Adler, all of which is now in Copenhagen) and the *παρεμβολαί* of Eustathius; Erbse makes it clear that Eustathius was not acquainted with A, but that he and the compiler of the *Genuinum* and the scribe of A were alike acquainted with a very elaborate commentary on the *Iliad* which went under the names of Apion and Herodorus (or Heliodorus), but which cannot have been compiled until after the fall of the Iconoclasts (say early in the ninth century?). Since it is one of Erbse's main purposes to reconstruct this commentary (which he refers to as 'ApH.'), he goes on in Chapter 5 (174-84) to discuss those passages from the VMK which are to be found only in 'Suidas'; and he concludes the first main section of the book with a chapter (184-209) on the tradition and sources of the 'h-Scholia' (i.e. the marginal commentary found in manuscripts of the family identified by Ludwig and Allen with the symbol h).

The second main section deals with "The most important witnesses to the bye-tradition" (if I may be allowed this rendering of *Nebenüberlieferung*). Here we meet successively Choeroboscus (213-29), whom Erbse following Maas wishes to date after rather than before the Iconoclast period, the *Epimerismoi* and *Eklogai* (230-50), Stephanus of Byzantium (251-69), Methodius, Orus,



and Orion (270-94), Ammonius (295-310), Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian (311-406; this long discussion is divided into two parts, of which the second is devoted to Herodian's system of accentuation—in this Laum's rejection of most of the evidence is comprehensively refuted), and Apollonius the Sophist.<sup>1</sup> The 'Nachwort' (433-8) deals with the 'Practical consequences for an edition of the scholia to the *Iliad*', and explains that, on the basis of the preceding argument, the author's intention is to publish a fully critical text of the two main commentaries whose existence can be inferred from the sources: the mainly critical 'ApH.' and the mainly exegetic 'c', with *testimonia* from the by-tradition.<sup>2</sup> This will require many years of further work, but it is already plain that the results to be expected will fully repay both the time and the labour which Erbse will have spent upon his work, and the time which its users will have had to wait for it.

Erbse's work is tremendously detailed, close-knit and thorough; and much of it can justly be described as the result of pioneering of the most arduous kind. Erbse has cleared and widened some trails which had been hacked out of the 'forest primeval' by his predecessors, but he has created more of his own, and in doing so he has shown that some of those which we have previously followed were at best dead ends. A critical examination of his arguments cannot be attempted here, but one important point of detail should be mentioned: at p. 126 Erbse accepts the view of B. Hemmerdinger (*R.E.G.* lxxix [1956], 433 f.) that A was written by the scribe Ephrem. Mons. J. Irigoin has now published an article, in *Scriptorium* for 1959, in which he deals *inter alia* with the *scriptorium* of Ephrem and observes (p. 183, note 3) that for technical reasons it is impossible to accept A of the *Iliad* as a product of that *scriptorium*. 'Who shall decide, when doctors disagree?'

University of Leeds

J. A. DAVISON

## PINDAR'S SKOLIA

B. A. VAN GRONINGEN: *Pindare au Banquet*. Les fragments des scolies édités avec un commentaire critique et explicatif. Pp. 132. Leiden: Sijthoff. 1960. Cloth, fl. 16.

THIS pleasing and useful book contains a short Preface and a sensible eight-page introduction, followed by text, apparatus, commentary, and discussion, of the eight Pindaric fragments (in Schroeder's and Snell's numeration, Nos. 122-8 inclusive) which van Groningen accepts as certainly forming parts of skolia, though he thinks it likely that some others deserve to be added to this list. He is positive (p. 15) that the skolia were not choric, but were accompanied solos.

<sup>1</sup> Some at least of these names will be familiar to those who know T. W. Allen's paper 'The Homeric Scholia' (*Proc. Brit. Acad.* xvii [1931], 1-31). It is understandable that Erbse seldom refers to Allen except to correct him.

<sup>2</sup> The *scholia minora* which go under the name of Didymus ('D-Scholia') are being

published by V. di Marco, and M. H. A. L. H. van der Valk is working on a new edition of Eustathius (for which he has manuscript material unknown to the Leipzig editor of 1825). When all these works are complete, we shall know the ancient commentaries to Homer as never before.

The first three of the fragments included, being the only ones of considerable length, occupy about three-quarters of the main body of the book. The most important are probably fr. 122 and 123. In fr. 122, the famous *πολύξεναι νεανίδες*, van Groningen first prints, with critical notes, most of the long quotation from the lost *περὶ Πινδάρου* of Chamaeleon of Heraclea, given by Athenaeus xiii. 573 ff. It is slightly regrettable that in his summary of this passage van Groningen writes 'les hiérodules' where Athenaeus has simply *τὰς εταίρας*. More serious is his assumption that the extant ode, *Ol.* 13, which celebrated Xenophon of Corinth's double victory at Olympia in 464 B.C., formed part of the same festivity which culminated in the banquet at which the skolion fr. 122 was sung. He writes (pp. 20, 21): 'Enfin le texte dit clairement que les festivités se sont déroulées en deux phases: celle où le choeur a chanté la grande ode triomphale, et ensuite (*ὑστερον*) celle où fut exécuté le scolie.'

Chamaeleon's words are: *Ξενοφῶν ὁ Κορίνθιος, ἐξῶν εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπάξεν εταίρας εὖξατο τῇ θεῷ νικήσας. Πίνδαρος δὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἔγραψεν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐγκώμιον οὗ ἡ ἀρχή, "Τρισολυμπιονίκαν ἑπαινέων οἶκον", ὑστερον δὲ καὶ σκόλιον τὸ παρὰ τὴν θυσίαν ᾄσθην, ἐν ᾗ τὴν ἀρχὴν εὐθέως πεποιήται πρὸς τὰς εταίρας, αἱ παραγενομένου τοῦ Ξενοφώντος καὶ θύοντος τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ συνέθυσαν.*

The natural meaning of *τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἔγραψεν* and *ὑστερον δὲ* is merely that Pindar wrote the skolion after first writing the ode, not that the two poems were performed in that order on a single occasion.

It is in fact incredible that *Ol.* 13 was performed at a festival in honour of Aphrodite, on the principle which van Groningen himself invokes on p. 39, in his note on l. 23 of the skolion, *ὦ Κύπρου θέσποινα*, 'l'invocation de la déesse, indispensable dans un poème chanté dans son temple': in *Ol.* 13, a very long ode, Aphrodite is not even mentioned.

Apart from this point, the commentary on fr. 122 is valuable. In the matter of the unconvincing Doric forms, condemned by most editors, *ποττὰν* l. 5, *λεξοῦντι* l. 13, and *Ξενοφῶν* l. 24, van Groningen makes the interesting suggestion that Chamaeleon, probably writing before Aristophanes edited Pindar, may have met the poem in a Corinthianized copy, preserved at Corinth. He seems right, with Wilamowitz, in dropping *τὰν* in l. 5, and reading *πρὸς Ἀφροδίταν*. He thinks it likely that only three lines are missing between l. 9 *πᾶν καλόν* and *ἀλλὰ θαυμάζω*, but he argues that after *βασάνω* (l. 16) more than one strophe is lost, including praises of Xenophon and especially of his Olympic victory.

Some details are questionable. It seems unreasonable to distinguish, as van Groningen does, the use of the verb in l. 8 *μαλθακὰς ὥρας ἀπὸ καρπὸν δρέψεσθαι*, from that found, for example, in fr. 123. 1, on the ground that in 122. 8 the verb must mean 'laisser cueillir un autre', not 'cueillir pour soi': it is surely more in the gracious spirit of this poem to regard the hierodules as blamelessly enjoying the fruit of their own youth and beauty, rather than serving as passive instruments of men's pleasure.

He seems right, however, in l. 16, when he accepts the difficult *διδάξαμεν*, in holding that Pindar is justifying his own skill in distinguishing true from false *ἀρετά*, against H. Fränkel's view that he means that friendship with Xenophon has led him to undertake an uncongenial task.

In the penultimate line he discusses learnedly and acutely the epithet *ἐκατόγγυιον* applied to *κορᾶν ἀγέλαν*. It is tempting to see in Sophocles'

ἐκατομπόδων Νηρήδων the key to the meaning, namely 'fifty girls', but the fact, which van Groningen reasonably stresses, that γυῖον means 'limb', and is applied to arms as well as to legs, is a serious difficulty. Common sense rejects Kleanthes' comically logical 'twenty-five girls' (each with two arms and two legs) and van Groningen is perhaps right in accepting Heyne's wide interpretation and paraphrasing 'un groupe considérable'.

He is also perhaps right in rejecting Boeckh's widely accepted suggestion that Xenophon had vowed to present this large body of hierodules to the temple: he prefers to suppose that he had simply promised to pay their expenses at the banquet.

In Chapter ii, 'Les Charmes de la Jeunesse', he has a good discussion of the known facts about Theoxenus of Tenedos, but it is unlucky that on p. 77 his full quotation of Suidas' account of Pindar's death has dropped the proper name from the phrase τὰ τοῦ ἐρωμένου Θεοξένου αὐτοῦ γόνατα, since this, as Wilamowitz remarks, is the only evidence for the identity of the boy on whose knees Pindar died, and vital for the dating of the skolion (fr. 123) to the poet's last years. It also seems perverse to prefer as the scene of Pindar's death the theatre (Suidas) to the gymnasium (Valerius Maximus) on the ground that 'la mort du poète a plus facilement pu rester inaperçue au théâtre, où l'attention de tous est dirigée vers la scène, qu'au gymnase où il y a un va-et-vient continu'. The moment of a sudden death in the audience might perhaps escape notice during a performance, but hardly during the emptying of the seats, and both ancient versions imply an imperceptibly quiet death: Valerius says that even the boy was unaware that Pindar had died till the gymnasium was being closed for the night.

The commentary on γυναικείῳ θράσει in l. 8 is excellent, but the novel solution of the problem of the last two lines, though neat and clever, is hardly convincing:

ἐν δ' ἄρα καὶ Τενέδῳ Πειθὸ τ' ἔναιεν  
καὶ Χάρις νῖον Ἀγέσιλας

Here van Groningen cannot swallow with Wilamowitz the accusative νῖον as object of ἔναιεν ('ein vornehmer Knabe, dem Peitho und Charis innewohnen'). This is, indeed, an expression hard to parallel, but Plato's epigram on Aristophanes has a general resemblance:

αἱ Χάριτες τέμενός τι λαβεῖν ὅπερ οὐχὶ πεσεῖται  
ζηλοῦσαι ψυχὴν εὖρον Ἀριστοφάνους.

This difficulty is met by van Groningen with the emendation χάρις for Χάρις: 'apparemment Peitho habitait à Ténédos et y a fait le gracieux cadeau du fils d'Hagésilas'. The loss of the wholly appropriate Χάρις is regrettable, and the active χαρίζω, though perfectly possible, has no early support in literature.

A curious lapse is van Groningen's note on ἀκτίνης in l. 2: 'métaphore fréquente. Cf. Aristophane *Vesp.* 1032 et *Pax* 755 δεινότεραι μὲν ἂν ὀφθαλμῶν Κύνης ἀκτίνες ἑλαμπον (l'occasion est tellement semblable qu'on songe à une imitation de la part d'Aristophane)'. The occasions could hardly be more different, for Aristophanes' words are part of a description of Cleon as a jagged-toothed hundred-headed τέρας whom, as a youthful playwright, he had attacked like a second Heracles.

Chapter iii, 'Les Illusions de l'Ivresse', deals with the song for Thrasybulus of Acragas, 124 a and 124 b, combined by Blass. Here in l. 2. van Groningen

shifts the full stop to before *μεταδόρπιον*, which seems an improvement. The hardest question in this poem is to guess the drift of the lost words which followed *τοὶ δ' αὖ πλουτέοντες* at the end of l. 8. Van Groningen argues that it must have run somewhat as follows: 'Les riches s'imaginent, sous l'empire de la boisson, qu'ils sont des modèles de bon sens, d'intelligence pratique. . . . L'erreur dans laquelle tombent les *πλουτέοντες* c'est de se croire tous, en vertu de leur situation sociale, les égaux des Thrasybule, des Xénocrate, des Théron. La vraie *φρόνησις* est l'apanage de quelques privilégiés, qui sont *σοφοὶ φνῆ* (*Ol.* 2. 86). Chez les autres elle n'est qu'illusion d'ivresse. La description de la façon dont ils expriment cette illusion s'est probablement trouvée dans les vers perdus: Athénée a condensé à l'extrême.'

This is certainly a more interesting supplement than Dissen's *pauperes sibi divites videntur: divites autem etiam ditiores et maiores*, but if all this is implied in Athenaeus' words, αἷξει γὰρ καὶ τρέφει μεγαλύνει τε τὴν ψυχὴν ἢ ἐν τοῖς πότοις διατριβή, ἀναζωπυροῦσα καὶ ἀνεγείρουσα μετὰ φρονήσεως τὸν ἐκάστων νοῦν, Athenaeus has indeed practised extreme condensation. The words *μετὰ φρονήσεως*, which van Groningen especially stresses, certainly call for explanation: perhaps some such word as *δόξης* or *ὑπολήψεως* has fallen out after *φρονήσεως*, and that might give the sort of sense which van Groningen seeks. Later on he carefully compares this poem with Bacchylides fr. 20 B Snell and decides for Pindar's priority.

Chapter iv, 'Le Dessert Musical' deals very sensibly with fr. 124 c, which, like Schroeder, Snell, and others, he detaches from 124 a and 124b, without, like Turyn, connecting it with 124 d, which he discusses as 'La Vertu apaisante de la Musique' in Chapter v.

This fragment was elicited by Wilamowitz from Philodemus and Plutarch. Here van Groningen wisely insists that both sources must be respected, though there is less serious corruption in Philodemus. His final reading agrees with Turyn's

βαρβιτίξαι θυμὸν ἀμβλύνοντα καὶ φωνὰν ἐν οἴνῳ

He prefers the manuscript *ἀμβλύνοντα* to Wytttenbach's *ἀμβλὸν ὄντα*, because he wishes to keep *βαρβιτίξαι* intransitive, with *θυμὸν* and *φωνὰν* as objects of *ἀμβλύνοντα*.

Chapter vi, 'Une invention et un bon conseil', is an interesting and valuable discussion of fr. 125 and 126, which, like most editors, he treats as parts of one poem, because Athenaeus implies that only one Pindaric skolion was addressed to Hieron, as both these fragments certainly were.

The most difficult part is the interpretation of fr. 125 and of the two Athenaeus passages which quote it. After weighing many alternatives, van Groningen writes (p. 122) 'Une traduction littérale se présente donc en définitive comme suit: "(le barbitos) que jadis le Lesbien Terpandre a inventé le premier, quand il entendait aux repas des Lydiens les accents d'accompagnement (variable et à l'octave) de la haute pectis".' He takes *ὕψηλās* in l. 3 to be equivalent to *ὀξείας*, rather than a reference to the instrument's shape or dimensions. In Athenaeus xiv. 36, p. 635 b (Kaibel iii, p. 401, l. 26) he makes the attractive suggestion that *πηκτίδα* is lost between *τὴν μάγαδιν* and *ὀνομάσαντα*.

Chapter vii, 'L'Amour, Apanage de la Jeunesse', discusses fr. 125, the famous *εἴη καὶ ἐρᾶν*. He rejects in l. 1 Christ's speciously attractive *ἐρᾶντι* for *ἔρωτι*. In l. 3 he accepts the difficult *ἀριθμοῦ*, and takes it to mean 'the



number of your years': he also insists that to interpret *πρᾶξιν* in l. 4 as 'sexual indulgence' makes nonsense of the poem.

The last chapter, 'Le Cottabe, Hommage de l'Amour', deals with the very obscure fr. 128. He writes ll. 2 and 3 thus:

ἔφρα σὺν Χειμέρῳ μάθων Ἀγαθωνίδα  
βέβω κότταβον.

He maintains that *κότταβον* here is simply the *λάταξ*, or drop of wine thrown on the ground, and not any form of the elaborate game. He relies chiefly on Athenaeus x. 30, p. 427 d (Kaibel ii p. 429, ll. 22 ff.) ἄλλ' ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τὸ μὲν σπένδων ἀποδοδόμενον τοῖς θεοῖς, ὃ δὲ κότταβος τοῖς ἐρωμένοις, and he quotes in support Callimachus fr. 69 Pfeiffer:

πολλοὶ καὶ φιλόντες Ἀκόντιον ἦκαν ἔραζε  
οἰνοπόται Σικελὰς ἐκ κυλίκων λάταγας.

Pfeiffer, however, thinks that the game is here described and that *ἦκαν* refers to the unlucky bad shots missing the *πλάστιγγες*, as described by schol. Lucian, *Lexiphanes*, 3, p. 195, 12 R.

The appropriate frontispiece shows both sides of the Ashby painter's *symposium* kylix in the British Museum, *A.R.V.*, p. 299, n. 7.

Trinity College, Cambridge

D. S. ROBERTSON

## SOPHOCLES' *TRACHINIAE*

J. C. KAMERBEEK: *The Plays of Sophocles. ii: The Trachiniae*. Pp. x+256. Leiden: Brill, 1959. Cloth, fl. 46.

THIS is the second volume of what is planned as a complete edition with commentary of the plays of Sophocles, an impressive project which all scholars must hope to see completed. Scholars and students in this country will be grateful that these commentaries are in English. The first volume was translated from the Dutch, with results not wholly satisfactory: the present volume was composed by the author in English and revised by Mr. D. A. S. Reid and Miss C. Campbell; the result is excellent and there is hardly anything to suggest that the author is using a foreign language.

This volume is on the same lines as the commentary on the *Ajax*. There is a list of deviations from the Oxford text, a brief but useful survey of the sources of the legend, a well-written account of the action of the play, with comments on the significance of each scene, and a short discussion on the 'Unity and Meaning' of the play, sensible if not particularly illuminating. (It would have been useful to have a connected and critical analysis of the main lines of interpretation that have been followed by modern scholars, defining the major points on which there is serious divergence of opinion.) The Introduction ends with a few pages on the dating of the play, in which Kamerbeek is rightly sceptical about the reliability of internal evidence but thinks it reasonable to 'range the *Trachiniae* with the *Ajax* and *Antigone*'. But the commentary is the main thing, and it is with the establishment and detailed interpretation of the text that the author is chiefly concerned.

For some explicit indication of Kamerbeek's views on the manuscript

tradition of Sophocles and the principles he adopts in constructing a text (and presumably for his treatment of lyric metres) we must wait for the final volume containing his text of the plays. Meanwhile he shows in this play, as in the *Ajax*, a general tendency to follow the manuscripts more faithfully than most editors, particularly Pearson, who goes rather far in the opposite direction; out of 125 deviations from Pearson's text there are at least fifty-two in which he returns to the manuscript reading rejected by Pearson and only three in which he accepts emendations where Pearson follows the manuscripts. He is right not to accept the need for emendation until the possibilities of interpreting the manuscript reading have been seriously reconsidered, and right to hold (if this principle can be deduced from his practice) that it is not an editor's business to improve on manuscript readings unless he is satisfied that they cannot be ascribed to Sophocles. Perhaps, however, more latitude should be allowed where a common corruption is concerned and/or a slight change provides a more satisfactory reading. For example in 66 *φέρεω* for *φέρει*, if not quite a 'certain emendation' (Jebb), is much to be preferred, since Deianira would surely be careful to show that she is quoting somebody else's reproach. There are also passages where Kamerbeek is prepared to ascribe to Sophocles Greek that seems rather dubious. For example 86g (with Campbell and Dain-Mazon) he keeps *ἀήθης* in the sense 'unlike herself', but there seems to be no parallel for this, and in the context an adjective of more precise meaning is needed. He mentions three conjectures, including Jebb's *ἀγρήθης*, but dismisses them without argument as unacceptable. 1062 his defence of the manuscript reading *γυνή δέ, θήλυς οἶσα κοῦκ ἀνδρός φύσιν* is not convincing. 1160 *πρὸς τῶν πνεόντων μηδεὶς θανεῖν ὑπο*, which he thinks 'a harsh construction but not impossible', does not seem to me to be tolerable, apart from the fact that elsewhere in tragedy *ἐμπεῖν*, not *πνεῖν*, is always used in the sense 'to be alive'.

A few further comments on details of text and interpretation. 77 (?76) *ἔλπει*: on the use of the imperfect reference might have been made to Jebb's appendix and L. R. Palmer's remarks in *J.H.S.* lxxiv. 209. 84 'a doublet originating from the poet himself' and 88-89 'a v.l. of the poet's not entirely rejected by him'; this may have been suggested by an observation by Dain (Budé Sophocles, i, p. xxxi), but in any case does not seem very likely. 122-3 *ἀδεῖα*: there is confirmation for this form of the neut. pl., but Kamerbeek does not consider Jebb's objection that *ἀδεῖα μὲν* does not provide a proper antithesis to *ἀντία δέ*. Musgrave's *αἰδοῖα* is hardly a certain correction, but it is easier and Jebb gives reasons (not mentioned by Kamerbeek) why corruption would be natural in this particular line. 164 Kamerbeek rightly keeps *τρίμητρον* and *κἀναΐστος*; the irregularity of syntax is here understandable and should not be smoothed away. 192 It is certainly tempting, with Lloyd-Jones, to take Heracles as subject of both verbs; the idiomatic use of *αὐτός* in the sense 'master of the house' perhaps lends a little support to this view. 234-5 Kamerbeek rightly accounts for the 'overemphasis on H.'s good health', but does not answer or mention Housman's objection to *ισχύοντά τε καὶ ζῶντα*, in that order. Jebb saw the point, though his explanation is not satisfactory and his translation 'alive and well' only serves to bring out the difficulty, as does Fraenkel's comparison (on *Ag.* 677) with Plautus' *vivit, valet*. 462 Kamerbeek rightly takes Heracles as subject of *ἐντακλή*. 554 Kamerbeek does not succeed in justifying *λύπημα*. 841-6 Kamerbeek makes a detailed and instructive attempt to vindicate the manuscript readings, and though his interpretation

involves difficulties I think he may be partly right, and certainly the remedies hitherto proposed are not satisfactory. Kamberbeek's sense for the manuscript *ἄοκνον* seems possible, whereas Musgrave's *ἄοκνος* cannot mean 'without foreboding' as several editors suppose. I would, however, accept *ἄοκνος*, but in the sense 'not shrinking from', taking *ὦν* as referring to the use of the supposed love charm. 1019-20 Kamberbeek, who rarely puts forward emendations of his own, offers an ingenious suggestion which gives easier sense than the Jebb-Pearson text but involves an initial corruption of *ἐκπέλει οὐδὲ ἔμπλεον*, as well as other changes. *ἐκπέλει* = *ἔξεστι* is rare, but is it so likely that a rare word of familiar form with a sense easily conjectured would be replaced by a word that does not make sense at all without three or four other changes? 1091 Kamberbeek rightly follows Campbell rather than Jebb. On the last lines he is probably right to take *παρθένε* as a collective designation of the chorus and to give these lines to the Coryphaeus, chiefly because the last line cannot very well be ascribed to Hyllus. He notes that in Sophocles chorus or Coryphaeus always ends the play (though there is some doubt about the *O.T.*); it may be added that this applies to all extant tragedies except the *Agamemnon* and *P.V.*, neither of which ends its trilogy. Apart from linguistic points Kamberbeek has some good comments on the dramatic significance of lines and scenes, where Jebb is often silent; examples are the notes on 390, 438, 493, 706, 1089-91, 1264-5.

One of the justifications for a new commentary on Sophocles is the need to take account of the numerous contributions in this field and to bring to bear on these plays the resources of scholarship developed in the last sixty years. Kamberbeek has evidently read widely in the literature on this play, and as far as I can judge he has not missed much. He has also made good use of recent work on Greek drama and the Greek language. For instance, on 126 his correction of Jebb is confirmed (if it was not inspired) by Denniston, *Greek Particles*, p. 195 (ii), whom he cites here and often. Not all references to the relevant literature are ideally chosen: for instance on the relationship of the prologue to the Euripidean type, it seems a little perverse to send the reader to Webster's *Introduction*, where he will find two sentences on that point, rather than to Kitto, who takes a similar line but has several pages of discussion (*Greek Tragedy*, pp. 294-7). On 205-25 one misses a reference to A. M. Dale's article 'Stasimon and Hyporcheme' (*Eranos*, xlviii. 14-20), and A. Y. Campbell's article on some textual problems (*C.Q.* viii [1958], 18-24) might have been mentioned.

A commentary on this scale and at this price inevitably challenges comparison with that of Jebb, to which it naturally owes a good deal, perhaps more than the reader might suppose; the remark at the end of the note on 637 'Thus in substance Jebb' could as well be said of a number of other notes. On this comparison it appears that Kamberbeek's commentary is a good deal shorter than Jebb's, partly because it does not contain the same wealth of parallel and illustrative passages, though it should be added that Kamberbeek gives us a good many new and valuable illustrations; partly because though Kamberbeek deals fully and admirably with some difficulties, there are others where he does not meet objections to his own view as fully as Jebb or provide as thorough an analysis of other possibilities. Some limitation in the scope of the commentary is evidently deliberate, since Kamberbeek tells us in his preface that he has endeavoured to avoid alike *nimis copiosas disputationes nimiamque*

*brevitatem*. At any rate we have much to be grateful for, and though Jebb remains indispensable, this is a most useful supplement and a valuable contribution to Sophoclean studies.

Bedford College, London

P. T. STEVENS

## THE AGON IN ARISTOPHANES

THOMAS GELZER: *Der epirrhematische Agon bei Aristophanes*. (Zetemata, Heft 23.) Pp. xiii + 296. Munich: Beck, 1960. Paper, DM. 35.

THIS exhaustive and scholarly study of the Agon in Old Comedy consists of three main parts. The first is a description of the agons in the surviving plays of Aristophanes; the second, a study of the Aristophanic agon in its context, in which Gelzer examines its dramatic function, and considers its component parts and their relation to the function of the agon as a whole. The third part consists of the application of the results of the preceding investigations to the history of Comedy as a whole, thus giving the study a wider relevance. The text of the book proper is preceded by a bibliography and an analytical table of the agons in the surviving plays of Aristophanes.

This table includes two passages, *Vesp.* 334-402 and *Av.* 327-99, which some will be surprised to find counted as agons. The only formal irregularities shown by the table are the absence of an antipnigos from the former 'agon' and of a pnigos from the latter; but it becomes clear, as we proceed, that there are many more difficulties in regarding these passages as agons, and that Gelzer himself is aware of them. He concedes (p. 251) that *Av.* 327-99 is an agon 'mit ziemlich verstümmelter Form' (cf. also pp. 43, 45) but has already observed other points, such as the use of trochees in the 'epirrhemata' (p. 84) and the unusual *κατακελευσμοί* (pp. 43, 81). (He might have added that *ἀλλὰ* in *Av.* 336 has not the same force as when it introduces a normal *κατακελευσμός*.) *Thesm.* 520-73, on the other hand, is classified under scenes similar in form, though different in content, from agons and 531-2 are described (p. 153) as 'zwei iambische Tetrameter, die mit *ἀλλὰ* beginnen' and (p. 154 n. 1), as having 'nur die Form, nicht den Inhalt' of a *κατακελευσμός*.

The irregularity of these scenes from *Vesp.* and *Av.* also raises doubts about Gelzer's distinction between the agon 'nach der Parodos' and that 'in der Diallage'. The former, he says (p. 47), is used 'an der festen Stelle nach der Parodos als schematische Form mit verschiedenartigem Inhalt'; the latter 'an verschiedenen Stellen im Stück in einem festen, gleichartigen inhaltlichen Zusammenhang'. The 'Diallage' consists (p. 48) of (1) 'Streit' (2) 'Abmachungen über ein Schiedsgericht' (3) 'Verhandlung' (the agon proper) (4) 'Urteil'. First, there are many agons which appear to fall into both categories, though the 'Diallage' does often constitute a recognizable sequence, and this analysis accommodates more easily agons which come after the Parabasis; on the other hand, it leaves the residue of agons 'nach der Parodos' confined to the above-mentioned examples from *Vesp.* and *Av.*, together with the first agon of *Eq.* (303-456), which, as Gelzer observes in a special note (p. 72), 'hat einige Ähnlichkeit mit den epirrhematischen Agonen als Verhandlung in der Diallage', but points out that 'es wird kein Schiedsrichter bestellt, und es werden keine Folgen vereinbart. Der Inhalt . . . ist auch keine Verhandlung über



einen Gegenstand, sondern nur ein rohes Kräfteressen.' This is true, but in view of the regularity of his agon in other respects, perhaps its peculiarities should rather be explained in terms of its inconclusiveness and the character of the rivals.

The conclusion to be drawn from all this, however, is not so much that Gelzer's analyses are erroneous as that no rigid line can be drawn between what is an agon and what is not (let alone between different kinds of agon). The ubiquity of epirrhematic or similar structures is shown, for example, by *Vesp.*, where Gelzer, besides analysing 334-402 as an agon, classifies 403-525 (pp. 155 ff.) as a scene with certain formal similarities to an agon; then follows immediately the principal agon, 526-724. He himself sometimes feels doubts: on *Pax* 582-656 (p. 153) he says 'es ist . . . fraglich, ob man diese Komposition als epirrhematischen Agon bezeichnen soll', and one feels the danger of overworking formal analysis, and wonders what this question means from the point of view of Aristophanes himself.

The book tends in fact to work in terms of formal analysis rather than of drama, and dramatic points are liable to be obscured by Gelzer's plan of discussing the agons as separate entities before examining them in a wider context. For instance, he says on the first agon of *Eg.* (p. 44): 'In Antode und Antikatakeusmos fordert der Chor wieder zum Reden auf, aber nicht den Gegenredner, den Paphlagonier' (cf. also p. 83); this is one of many structural points which serve a definite dramatic purpose, of depicting the Paphlagonian as universally disliked and entirely dependent on his unscrupulousness for survival. (Another is the hostility of the Chorus from the start, whereas so often the Chorus is on the 'wrong' side at first.) Later (p. 106) Gelzer notes that 'Hier (843, 2nd Agon) nimmt der Paphlagonier das Wort, obschon im Antikatakeusmos der Wurstler zum Reden aufgefordert wird. Das soll wohl die Unverschämtheit des Paphlagoniers charakterisieren und wäre dann eine beabsichtigte Ausnahme'. But these are inter-connected points; and the dramatic interpretation would have been greatly helped if such connexions had been made clear from the beginning.

It is perhaps this tendency to concentrate on parts instead of wholes that is largely responsible for Gelzer's rather schematic treatment of individual plays like *Nub.*, which he treats somewhat in the manner of Zieliński, and *Ran.*, and for his division of Aristophanes' career into three periods, bounded by the Peace of Nicias and the fall of Athens. Each of these periods he regards as having its own individual characteristics; the plays in the first are more sectional in form, those of the second more unified; the agons in the first are clearly defined contests between two characters, whereas the 'Darlegungsagon' (as Gelzer translates Whittaker's term 'agon of exposition') is characteristic of the second. The third period is undeniably distinguishable (on our evidence), the other two, however, much less so; and the similarities between corresponding scenes in two plays of the same period are sometimes outweighed by the differences: e.g. (p. 252) Gelzer classifies the agon of *Lys.* as a 'Darlegungsagon', like that of *Av.*; but the role played by the Proboulos is surely in a dramatic sense that of opponent, a character totally absent from the agon of *Av.*, as witness his rhetorical questions and hostile tone. So with the characters: 'Gegenüber der rechtschaffenen Moralität der Dikaiopolis, Bdelykleon, Trygaios meldet sich in der zweiten Periode die Frivolität und Verschlagenheit der Typen wie Peishetairos und des Verwandten des Euripides', says Gelzer

(p. 259); but how deep does this distinction really go, and what about *Lysistrata*?

All this, however, does not affect the fact that Gelzer has produced a scholarly work which will be indispensable to Aristophanists. It is careful and thorough, and the care extends to the excellent indexes.

Exeter College, Oxford

D. MERVYN JONES

## TZETZES ON THE *PLUTUS*

Ioannis Tzetzae *Commentarii in Aristophanem*. Ediderunt Lydia MASSA POSITANO, D. HOLWERDA, W. J. W. KOSTER. Fasc. 1 continens prolegomena et commentarium in *Plutum*. Pp. cxxviii+365. Groningen: Wolters, 1960. Cloth, fl. 70.

TZETZES can never have had it so good as in this beautifully produced volume, which contains his scholia and glosses on the *Plutus* with prolegomena and 'Animadversiones Criticae', and also general prolegomena on Tzetzes and the manuscripts by Koster and Holwerda, together with Holwerda's prolegomena to his forthcoming edition of the Tzetzes-scholia on the *Clouds*. As the tables on pp. xxii f. show, these scholia have never (except for a few specimen passages) been edited before, and the editors have placed students of Aristophanes and Byzantine scholarship deeply in their debt by the present work. For Tzetzes, for all the disparagement he has suffered (as from Sandys), is an important figure in the history of scholarship, both for himself and for sources now lost to which he had access. We do not know the precise extent of his work on Aristophanes: the statement in the argument to *Birds* that he *θειάζει καὶ ἐξάγει* the play *ὡς Λυσιστράτην, Ἀχαρνεῖς, Εἰρήνην τε καὶ ἄλλα* or the passage *Chil.* xii. 659 ff., quoted by Zuretti, does not prove that he wrote commentaries on all these plays, as Koster rightly says (though he might perhaps have quoted the evidence in full, in view of the scale of the prolegomena in general). Nor, as more recent critics like White and Zuntz have pointed out, is the quality of his work always bad, though he does not attain modern or Alexandrian standards; and Koster is perhaps a little inclined to think of him as if he were a modern, as when (p. ii) he says 'etiam eis locis ubi aliam lectionem praetulit, textum non mutavit' and goes on to talk of his 'textum traditum intactum relinquendi studium', whereas the concept of a text representing exactly the editor's opinion is relatively recent, and in Aristophanes the same criticism applies to Küster (a striking instance at *Ach.* 126) and even Brunck.

The manuscripts are described with exemplary thoroughness, and also, as in the description of the *Plutus*-scholia in the Urbinas, with an acumen which recalls Zacher's work on the Venetus. Massa Positano is, however, perhaps too ready to assume that the scribe copied from at least two originals; the facts are explained more easily by the hypothesis (which amounts to the same thing in the long run) that he used a single manuscript heavily corrected by more than one hand, like Γ, say, in the *Knights* or the *Birds*. This would explain the fact that the dislocation of the order of the scholia is most noticeable in the earlier part of the play, before a corrector's energy would have begun to flag (a phenomenon again observable in Γ); this is perhaps more probable than that 'librarius . . .

cum ad primae sectionis perturbationem animum vertisset, remedium quoddam attulit'. Again, several scholia in *Eq.* (e.g. 687, 794, 817) have been inserted by Γ<sup>3</sup> which had already been put in by one or both of his predecessors, and the scholia inserted by Γ<sup>3</sup> on f. 97 (see White, *Schol. Av.* p. xc, n. 1) are headed by the words *σχόλια [sic] τῆς ἐπιούσης ἐρμηνείας*, which provides an interesting parallel to the note on f. 85 v. in U.

In the discussion of variants there is an occasional failure to distinguish the significant from the insignificant; e.g. the omission of *κῆρες* in schol. *Plut.* 555 (= p. 134. 1. 20 Pos.) is due to the simplest of palaeographical causes and tells us nothing about the affinities of manuscripts containing the error. Insignificant variants also take up an enormous amount of space in the apparatus to the text, and orthographica are noted with ruthless regularity every time they occur; by contrast, an element of imprecision is introduced by the frequent use of the phrase 'schol. Düb.' as if Dübner were a primary source. The collating is, however, mostly very accurate, and the only errors I have noticed on the specimen pages reproduced in facsimile are (not counting matter lost at the ends of lines): 8a 1. 26 *μᾶλλον καὶ ἐξεστηκότα φρενῶν* cod., 536 1. 13 *ἐν ὄρει* cod., 550 1. 23 *καὶ θέλοντα* cod. This relative freedom from error is the more praiseworthy, in that the frequent transpositions of whole sections in the text make the task of collation much more difficult.

The bibliography at the end of the book is somewhat arbitrarily selected and Holzinger's commentary (*S.A.W.W.* 218. 3) a most conspicuous, though not the only, unexpected absentee from it; there are also one or two omissions from the 'conspectus eorum scholiorum, quae edita iam sunt . . .' (pp. xxii f.), e.g. 9: Zacher p. 602, 509 (U) Koster *de Tzetza* p. 7.

Although these scholia afford relatively little scope for the emender's art, Massa Positano has contributed a fair number of corrections, notably 912 (U) *εἶτα ἐν τῇ χειρὶ for αὐτὸν μὴ χειρὶ*. Occasionally she overlooks a predecessor, e.g. Zuretti at 9b 1. 10 *ἐμνήσθη*, or bases herself on an erroneous principle as at 27 l. 21 *τὸν κλεπτίστατον* (cf. White on schol. *Av.* 26).

The 'Animadversiones Criticae' are a mine of information, though perhaps more parallels might have been quoted from the Aristophanes scholia, e.g. schol. *Eq.* 633 at 271, and material is sometimes amassed somewhat indiscriminately, as at 6. Here, as elsewhere in the book, one sees the value of the precept *τῇ χειρὶ σπεῖρειν μὴ ὀλῶ τῷ θυλάκῳ*. Wendel (as Maas pointed out in his review of the Apollonius-scholia) has shown the way.

Exeter College, Oxford

D. MERVYN JONES

## THUCYDIDES IN GERMAN DRESS

Thukydides: *Geschichte des peloponnesischen Krieges*, eingeleitet und übertragen von GEORG PETER LANDMANN. Pp. 730; 1 plate, 1 map. Zürich: Artemis Verlag, 1960. Cloth, 28.50 Sw. fr.

To successive generations Thucydides seems so modern that Greekless readers are best introduced to his work through translations written in the idiom of their own day. That is only one reason for welcoming this German translation. To translate the whole History is a formidable undertaking, and the translator, who is a schoolmaster at Basle, has evidently devoted much care to a task begun more than ten years ago (p. 730). It would be unwise for anyone whose

native language is not German to pass judgement on the literary merits of the translation; but it seems to be very readable. It is also on the whole accurate, though some criticisms will be found below. Every effort has been made to avoid paraphrase and the omission of the seemingly unimportant words which contribute so much to the style of Thucydides.

The treatment of the speeches is thoroughly competent. The speech of Alcibiades at Sparta (vi. 89-92), which imposes a severe test, may be taken as an example (pp. 505-8). The forcefulness and unconventionality of the speaker are well brought out by Landmann, but there is occasionally some lack of precision. A remarkably persistent error is his refusal to give comparatives their full comparative force, which is wholly or partly lost in his renderings of the following: *χείρον*, 89. 1; *χείρω*, 89. 3; *πονηρότερα*, 89. 5; *εὐπορώτερον*, 90. 4; *ἥσσον*, 91. 5; *προθυμότερον*, 92. 1; *χείρων*, 92. 2; *μᾶλλον*, 92. 4 (cf. iii. 13. 7, *θρασύτερον*; the converse occurs in vii. 48. 1, *μετὰ πολλῶν*). Other inaccuracies are: the omission of *πολλούς* (90. 3), inadequate translations of *καλύψετε*, *τὰ πολλά* and *δολιγωρήσουσιν* (all in 91. 7), and the failure to make clear that the imperfect *ἦκαζον* (92. 5) refers to the period, now ended, when Alcibiades was a war leader on the Athenian side.

A passage providing a test of a somewhat different kind is the famous vindication of Pericles and his war policy (ii. 65), in which every word must be carefully weighed. Here the translation of *ἰδίᾳ δέ* (2) fails to stress sufficiently the contrast with *δημοσίᾳ μὲν*. There are two further examples of unwillingness to translate comparatives literally, *ἐπὶ πλεον ἔτι* (6) and *τῷ πλεονί μορίῳ* (12). Landmann, like other scholars, misrepresents the view of Thucydides on the Sicilian expedition expressed in the well-known *οὐ τοσοῦτον γνώμης ἀμάρτημα* (11) by watering down *τοσοῦτον* ('eigentlich nicht falsch war im Plan': in i. 9. 1, *τοσοῦτον* is ignored, but in i. 11. 1 is given its true meaning). Other passages cannot be discussed here, but the following points may be noted: i. 4, *ὡς εἰκός* means not 'vermutlich' but 'as was natural'; iv. 103. 3, Brasidas has somehow been substituted for Perdiccas; v. 26. 5, 'ich musste' is very flat for *ἐνέβη μοι* in the much-quoted reference by Thucydides to his exile; vii. 48. 4, *ἀπῆλθον* is ignored; the resumptive *δ' οὖν* is not always adequately translated (cf. i. 3. 4, viii. 81. 3 and 87. 6), and is omitted in vii. 59. 2.

The introduction (pp. 5-19) after a somewhat grandiloquent beginning discusses with clarity and good sense characteristics of Thucydides to which the attention of readers should be drawn. 'Nie urteilt er nach dem Erfolg, immer nach der Richtigkeit der getroffenen Massnahmen' (p. 16) is an excellent point, but in seeking to illustrate it from the career of Demosthenes Landmann is strangely inaccurate. Demosthenes was defeated in Aetolia, not 'bei den Akarnanen', and his planning and execution of this campaign were, as Thucydides makes abundantly clear (iii. 95. 1 and 97. 2), by no means faultless but rash and over-optimistic.

The notes (pp. 665-81) are not intended to be learned but to provide the layman with explanatory information. The longest (pp. 676-7) is an excellent discussion of the Melian Dialogue. To infer, even tentatively, from the Peisistratid digression that Thucydides 'habe im Grund von einer gerechten Monarchie geträumt' (p. 678) is strange. A statement about Attic demes (p. 679) is false, and the Council of the Five Hundred was recruited not from the whole citizen-body (p. 680) but from citizens over thirty.

The index is full and good. The section on historical and mythical persons



includes biographical notes on many of them. There are some minor errors: for example, s.v. Herakleides, the Syracusan general whose appointment is mentioned in vi. 103. 4 must have been the son of Aristogenes (cf. Xen. *Hell.* i. 2. 8) and should be distinguished from his namesake mentioned in vi. 73. 1; s.v. Phormion, 'Asopios' Sohn von Athen' should be added, and whatever the date of his death it was certainly not 430. The geographical section gives a map-reference, wherever possible, to the excellent folding-map.

University of Manchester

H. D. WESTLAKE

## HIPPARCHUS AS GEOGRAPHER

D. R. DICKS: *The Geographical Fragments of Hipparchus*. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary. Pp. xi + 215; 8 mathematical diagrams, 1 map. London: Athlone Press, 1960. Cloth, 45s.

HIPPARCHUS, who discovered the precession of the equinoxes and laid the foundations of spherical trigonometry, must be reckoned among the greatest mathematicians and astronomers of antiquity; and it is tantalizing that knowledge of his life is confined to a single anecdote—by Aelian, telling how he amazed Hieron by wearing a leather cloak in the theatre because he foresaw there was a storm in the offing though the weather was fine. It is even more tantalizing that of the score or so of treatises that he wrote only one is now extant, and that an early work, his *Commentary on the 'Phenomena' of Aratus and Eudoxus*, to some extent out-moded by his later discovery of precession. It is true that from references in other writers further details may be gleaned or deduced, and in his scholarly and thorough introduction to this collection of the geographical fragments Dr. Dicks sets them out convincingly. He was born in Bithynia and was a citizen of Nicaea. He made observations there before pursuing his astronomical researches at Rhodes, and he may safely be credited with records of autumnal and vernal equinoxes from 162 to 128 B.C.

Dicks believes he has identified 140 fragments from eleven works by Hipparchus which have not survived but whose titles are known. (Two others are known from their titles alone, and it is probable that Hipparchus wrote yet another four or five works.) Dicks's thesis for a doctorate of the University of London in 1953 dealt with all these fragments, and now he has published the sixty-three relating to geographical matters with a translation and valuable commentary as well as the introduction already mentioned. It is greatly to be hoped that he will be able to fulfil his wish of bringing out a later volume of astronomical and mathematical fragments. The volume now presented to the reader is the first in a new series of University of London Classical Studies to be edited under the auspices of the Institute of Classical Studies; the series has got off to a good start.

The sixty-three fragments may all be attributed to a single work by Hipparchus *Against the 'Geography' of Eratosthenes*. This was in three books, and Dicks has made a creditable effort to assign the fragments to the three books in the order of Hipparchus. The previous editor of the geographical fragments, E. H. Berger, was not so ambitious, but the study of ancient science has greatly advanced since he published *Die geographischen Fragmente des Hipparch* in 1869, and Dicks joins issue with him at many points. Berger is not alone in coming under the censure of Dicks, who writes with such assurance that he

reprimands George Sarton for carelessly speaking of Hipparchus as 'a Greek-speaking Alexandrian' and takes Dr. Aubrey Diller severely to task for his justification of Posidonius' measurement of the earth. Diller's thesis is that the 252,000 stades given for the circumference of the earth by Eratosthenes and the 180,000 stades given by Posidonius are practically equivalent, the former measurement being in the shorter stades of which there are 10 to the Roman mile, the latter in the larger Philetairan stade of which there are  $7\frac{1}{2}$  to the Roman mile; as the two are directly compared Dicks thinks this impossible. Dicks also crosses swords with Diller for his explanation of Ptolemy's statement, after noting his agreement with Eratosthenes and Hipparchus that the arc between the tropics lies between  $47\frac{1}{2}^\circ$  and  $47\frac{3}{4}^\circ$ , that this amounts to almost exactly  $\frac{1}{11}$  of the circumference. It is a puzzling fraction, and Dicks has not closed the discussion. Theon of Smyrna is probably wrong in attributing the fraction to Eratosthenes, and in Dicks's opinion Hipparchus was the first astronomer to divide the circle into  $360^\circ$  as a matter of course. Eratosthenes was content with a division into sixtieths, and although Hypsicles has been assigned, for shaky reasons, a date c. 180 B.C., he may have flourished as late as the first or second century A.D.

It is clear from such passages that much of Hipparchus' work was mathematical, and his third book was specifically devoted to mathematical geography. This has to be borne in mind in considering his contribution to the concept of *κλίματα*. The word *κλίμα*, literally 'inclination', derives from the gradually increasing slope of the polar axis of the celestial sphere to the horizon as the observer moves farther away from the equator; it comes to mean simply 'latitude', and then a narrow belt of land on either side of a parallel. Dicks believes that Hipparchus may have been responsible for adapting the term to designate geographical latitude in conformity with his own concept of a mathematical geography based on astronomical observations. He insisted on the necessity for determining the *κλίματα* by means of astronomical data such as the length of the solstitial day, shadow ratios from the gnomon, the maximum elevation of the sun, and the relative positions of the fixed stars and constellations. Dicks regards this as Hipparchus' most important contribution to scientific geography.

Unfortunately most of our knowledge of Hipparchus' work on this subject comes through Strabo, a purely descriptive geographer, who had no aptitude or taste for mathematics and apologized because it made dry reading. No fewer than fifty-five of the sixty-three fragments are drawn from this unsympathetic source; Marinus as quoted by Ptolemy contributes two, and the other runs are scored in singles by Ptolemy himself in the *Syntaxis*, a scholiast to his *Geography*, Eustathius, Synesius, and in Latin Pomponius Mela and Pliny the Elder. They are prefaced by twelve quotations from varied authors bearing on Hipparchus' life. There is no attempt at an apparatus criticus—always a problem with selections—but important textual questions are dealt with in the notes. Except for Terzaghi's edition of Synesius, Dicks does not indicate whether his text is based on some standard edition. The Index of Greek words has only twenty-five entries, but it covers all the novel words, including *πνευρολογία*, translated as 'by pressing it in', which is not in Liddell and Scott.

## PORTRAIT OF RUDOLF PFEIFFER

RUDOLF PFEIFFER: *Ausgewählte Schriften: Aufsätze und Vorträge zur griechischen Dichtung und zum Humanismus*. Pp. ix+304; front., 6 plates. Munich: Beck, 1960. Cloth, DM. 28.

PROFESSOR PFEIFFER's friends and admirers in this country will be heartily grateful to his colleagues in Munich for the way in which they have chosen to celebrate his seventieth birthday. No Festschrift could be so precious as a selection from the writings of one of the greatest scholars of our time. This selection has been made in consultation with the author; and though no choice could content every reader, all will agree that the articles here reprinted give an excellent notion of the man and his work. The book has been admirably edited by Dr. Winfried Bühler, who has supplied it with a useful index; and it contains a valuable bibliography of virtually all Pfeiffer's writings.

Pfeiffer is both a great Greek scholar and a great historian of scholarship; and the space available in this book has been evenly divided between these two main activities. The author is known above all for his massive contribution to the understanding of Callimachus, beginning in 1921 with the appearance in H. Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte* of his *editio minor* of the fragments that had become known since Schneider's edition, and culminating in his great Oxford edition of 1949-53. But of the many important articles on Callimachus published during that period, only that on the prologue of the *Aitia* has been reprinted. These pieces are all in some measure superseded by the great book itself, and one can easily sympathize with their author's unwillingness to reprint them; yet they remain essential reading for the scholar seriously interested in this poet, who will study them with due regard to the date of their first appearance. Not unnaturally the volume contains the four important pieces dealing with Hellenistic poetry published in English during Pfeiffer's residence in this country (1938-51), which are less accessible in Germany than his other writings. Otherwise, the first half of the book is entirely devoted to articles on early epic and on tragedy; except that it contains the polished lecture entitled 'Gottheit und Individuum in der frühgriechischen Lyrik' with which Pfeiffer inaugurated his tenure of the chair at Freiburg in 1928. The papers in the second come, for the most part, from less accessible periodicals, and will be less familiar to the public. Written with profound learning, and in a style that combines clarity, elegance, and charm, they range over the whole history of scholarship from the Renaissance to the present day; yet the view of scholarship, and indeed of life, that emerges from them has a singular consistency. Pfeiffer has always shown a special interest in Erasmus; and this book contains a brilliant sketch of his career, setting right the popular misconceptions that make him out an eighteenth-century rationalist before his time, advocating a semi-pagan religion of aesthetics that retained Christian ethics while jettisoning Christian dogma. Pfeiffer shows how Erasmus rightly regarded himself as a follower of Clement, Origen, and Augustine in the attempt to bring about a union between Christianity and the humanism of the ancient world, and how his critical scholarship, far from cultivating aestheticism or erudition for its own sake, never ceased to be systematically directed to that end. In order to prove that Erasmian humanism can be blended with Christian religion, even in the

person of a saint, Pfeiffer movingly appeals to the example of Thomas More, *omnium horarum homo*.

Pfeiffer's interest in Erasmus gives the key to his whole conception of scholarship; for it is impossible to read this book without seeing that the author himself is a confirmed believer in the *philosophia Christi* that Erasmus conceived. Erasmus pleaded for what he called *libertas spiritus* in the name of religion itself; for the critical study that was urgently necessary in order to free the texts of the Bible and the Fathers from corruptions and accretions could do only good to the cause of religious truth. A sketch of the Benedictine contribution to learning and education acknowledges the author's debt to the Benedictine foundation of St. Stephan where he received his early education; and he concludes his account of Wilhelm von Humboldt, the scholar and philologist, diplomat and administrator, who played so great a part in laying the foundations of the great resurgence of German culture that followed the defeat of Napoleon, by an expression of regret that religion was absent from Humboldt's noble and idealistic view of life. In fact singularly few great classical scholars have been devout Catholics; but Pfeiffer's belief never narrows his sympathies or affects his severe critical standards. He shows, for example, profound sympathy with Goethe and with Wilamowitz, neither of whom possessed an *anima naturaliter Christiana*.

The essay concerned with Goethe aims at vindicating him against Nietzsche's charge that he did not truly understand the ancient Greeks. Pfeiffer shows, with great lucidity and penetration, that Goethe's view of the universe and of man's place in it is much indebted to and in some ways closely resembles that of the Greeks before Plato. Yet he does not go closely into the details of Nietzsche's criticism; and the reader may well be left with the impression that, despite the genuine Hellenism that was an important factor in his thought, Goethe stood too close to the classicism of Winckelmann and his generation to appreciate to the full the powerful elements which Nietzsche called 'Dionysiac' and which scholars since his time have done so much to illuminate.

Perhaps the most delightful essay in the book is that upon Conrad Peutinger, the town chronicler of Pfeiffer's native city of Augsburg during the first part of the sixteenth century, who played an important part at the Diet of Worms and did pioneer work in the study of Roman remains in Germany. Peutinger was a man of affairs who enjoyed the confidence of the Emperor Maximilian and a scholar of international importance who had links with Erasmus and his English disciples and with Politian and the Florentine circle of Ficino. But Pfeiffer shows how firmly he was rooted in his own city of Augsburg, one of those ancient civic communities whose intellectual life, like that of the Nuremberg of Dürer and Pirkheimer, reached far back into the Middle Ages. He quotes the charming letters, written in excellent Latin, which Peutinger's daughter sent him during his long absences; he describes the *sodalitas literaria Augustana*, including among its members distinguished citizens of many different professions; and he shows the importance to Peutinger of his close connexion with the neighbouring Benedictine Abbey of St. Ulrich. Reading this essay, it is impossible not to see how much of this humane and civilized tradition in South Germany has survived, in spite of everything, into the present time, and that this writer's interest in his subject is no mere pious antiquarianism.

The photograph of Professor Pfeiffer that serves as frontispiece is an excellent likeness; and the book itself gives a true portrait of a scholar whose



writings deserve the close attention of any reader who cares for Greek scholarship and for humane studies.

Christ Church, Oxford

HUGH LLOYD-JONES

## GREEK MORAL VALUES

ARTHUR W. H. ADKINS: *Merit and Responsibility*. A Study in Greek Values. Pp. xiv+380. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960. Cloth, 42s. net.

DR. ADKINS provides both for Greek scholars and for the Greekless reader an interesting study of Greek values from Homer to Aristotle. The connecting thread is the concept of moral responsibility, the very unimportance of which in Greek thought illustrates the divergence between the presuppositions of Greek ethics and our own. We are shown how in Homer the *ἀρετή* of a man consisted not of 'quiet' moral virtue, but of skill and success in peace and war, together with wealth and social position; and how, despite attempts that were made to elevate the importance of the 'quiet' moral virtues (usually by attaching them to *ἀρετή* as means to an end), and despite modifications that resulted from the changing needs of society, the traditional conception persisted. Perhaps the chief merit of this book lies in bringing out the extent of this persistence (which is often under-estimated or overlooked) and its results (often unrecognized)—in particular, the problems that faced the moralist who wished to recommend the 'quiet' virtues. There is an appendix on the Scopas-fragment of Simonides, of which a new interpretation is offered.

Most of Adkins's main arguments, at least in the first half of the book, will probably be generally accepted, though there will always be room for differences of opinion over the meaning of individual passages. For example, may not *πεπρωμένον αἶσῃ* at *Iliad* xxii. 179 mean not 'subject to *aîsa*' (p. 19), which does not suit xv. 209 (of Zeus, *ὅμῃ πεπρωμένον αἶσῃ*), but 'assigned to a destiny' or something like *donatum sorte*, 'endowed with a destiny'? If so, one cannot be sure that 'Zeus can . . . overset Fate' (p. 19), as Zeus himself may have done the assigning or endowing in this case. Likewise in using his golden scales (*Iliad* viii. 70 f.) Zeus *may* be, not discovering what Fate decrees, but making up his own mind which side should win (cf. xvi. 658; xix. 223 f.), in which case the time when a man dies may be (usually, at least) at Zeus' discretion.

The old ideas about *ἀρετή* and *αἶσχος*, in the light of which we have to understand Achilles (and not least his proposing to give the second prize in a race to the man who finished last, because he was *ἀπίστος*), explain blood feuds (and the emphasis on *retributive* justice, condemned by Sophocles and Euripides), the notion of the *ἀγαθὸς πολίτης* (who helps his friends and harms his enemies), and much more besides. *Ἀγαθός*, it seems, is first used in a 'quiet' sense in Euripides' *Electra*. But occasionally Adkins seems to overstate his case. He suggests that 'the requirements of law are overset' (p. 209) by the consideration given in the courts to 'liturgies' performed in the past by the defendant, and to the claims of his *ἀρετή*. But if this were entirely true, we might expect to find counsel sometimes devoting *most* of their speeches to the *ἀρετή* of their clients, and perhaps even pleading (explicitly or by implication) that an act of *ἀδικία* had been an act of *ἀρετή*. On the other hand, a jury might think it *δίκαιον* to acquit a man of previous good character who had committed some offence,

just as now he might be discharged. The accused who in Lysias xxv declares that he hoped by earning a good reputation to stand a better chance in a court 'should some misfortune overtake me' (p. 202) does not *admit* that he hoped by such means to win favour if he were *guilty*. Adkins is also rather hard on Plato. Some infiltration of 'morality' into the group of values based on ἀρετή had resulted in a certain amount of confusion in the use of terms, and Plato derives fallacious arguments from this, for use *ad homines*. But in the *Republic* (427 d), when Socrates says that his imagined state will be perfectly ἀγαθή, and therefore wise, brave, prudent, and just, he should surely not be accused of begging the question of the desirability of justice for its own sake (p. 286). Justice was recognized as promoting the welfare of society even in Homer (*Od.* xix. 108 f.), and it was the intrinsic value to the *individual* of practising justice that Socrates promised to *demonstrate* (367 b). Further, the analogy with the state is called a 'trick', because *sophrosune* and *dikaiosune* here 'bear no resemblance to *sophrosune* and *dikaiosune* as ordinarily understood' (p. 289). But the idea that each distinct group in society should concern itself with its own affairs and respect the rights of the rest—for similar ideas before Plato cf. *C.Q.* vi (1912), 246 f.—is the natural counterpart, at group level, of the individual's δικαιοσύνη as, apparently, ordinarily understood (cf. 433 e). Adkins suggests (p. 288) that 'if a qualified political expert exploits his subjects to the utmost', he will be behaving with δικαιοσύνη as here defined. But Plato's rulers are *ex hypothesi* 'eager to do whatever they believe is for the good of the commonwealth, and never willing to act against its interest' (412 d), and that is probably a tacit assumption in this definition.

Adkins's book is valuable—somewhat heavy going for the general reader, perhaps, and with rather too much recapitulation; but the method of approach is good, and a book of this kind was needed. Scholars in many fields of Greek literature should find it useful.

P. 76, line 28, read 'In this'; p. 107, footnote c, insert c; p. 173, l. 4, and p. 215, n. 6, close inverted commas; p. 275, l. 32, for 'matter' read 'manner' (?); p. 286, note a, read '427 c'; p. 298, l. 33, for 'on' read 'in'.

University of Manchester

R. S. BLUCK

## THE LUCRETIAN QUESTION

UFALEDO PIZZANI: *Il problema del testo e della composizione del De rerum natura di Lucrezio*. Pp. 192. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1959. Paper, L. 1,800.

This book, written by a pupil of Professor Paratore, sets out 'to examine as a whole the question of the text and composition of the *De Rerum Natura*, not with the intention of offering a final solution, but more simply of attempting a wider clarification in the light of the most recent studies, and as far as the extreme difficulty of the subject and the limited experience of its young author allow'. So the Preface. No one will expect a final solution in view of the obvious inadequacy of the external evidence, the corrupt state of the text, and the uncertainty of the criteria and arguments so far employed in dealing with the problem of composition. But the author has industriously studied the literature which goes on accumulating around the poem, and is sensible, often acute,

and always patient in discussing the diverse hypotheses, some fanciful, some mere possibilities, few much more than weak probabilities, and yet asserted at times with an apparent confidence by scholars who would hardly dare conduct even the more trivial business of their lives on such uncertain suppositions. The author allows himself only an exclamation mark in mentioning the recent attempt to deny the existence of a poet of the name of Lucretius (p. 10, footnote).

The book begins with Cicero's reply to his brother and Jerome's even more tantalizing entry in his Chronicle, and attempts to answer two main questions: whether we can infer from this evidence that Lucretius left his poem unrevised or incomplete, and whether and in what sense Cicero was concerned in the process which led to its publication. The first chapter, which includes a discussion of all the usual questions of interpretation and chronology, ends by concluding that Jerome refers to Marcus Cicero; that Marcus' letter confirms that he had some direct connexion with the poem, though it tells us nothing about whether he or Quintus was concerned with its publication, without excluding either hypothesis; that neither Cicero's hostility to Epicureanism nor his subsequent silence about the poem is sufficient to disprove that at one time he had concerned himself with it; that we may accept Jerome's statement that Cicero 'emended' the poem in the sense, not that he was involved in 'long and detailed work', but that he was somehow interposed in the 'process which led to publication'. The compilatory nature of Jerome's additions to Eusebius, as shown in other of his entries and as suggested by the sentence-structure of his entry about Lucretius, allows us to accept one part of what he says without having to accept the rest. The alleged suicide of Lucretius following madness due to a love philtre is itself suspect because of the similar rumour attached to the similar name of Lucullus by Plutarch after Nepos, whom Jerome is believed to have used among his sources. This suspicion is at least agreeable with the thought that Lactantius, writing before Jerome, would be likely to have known of any actual madness of Lucretius and to have appealed to this in dismissing his theories as 'mad'. We cannot infer either from Jerome's *aliquot libros* or from Cicero's *poemata* that the poem was left substantially incomplete.

The second chapter examines the direct tradition and the indirect tradition both ancient and medieval. By familiar arguments we are led to the conclusion that the direct tradition is absolutely 'closed' and contains no trace of readings which might suggest a source independent of the archetype. Though this is incidental to his main interest, Pizzani considers the status of the Italian manuscripts, and prefers to agree with Diels that the manuscript found by Poggio is dependent on the Leyden manuscripts. In evidence of this he finds the agreement of the Italian manuscripts with *O* corrected more cogent than the examples adduced by Martin, in evidence against this, of wrong word-divisions where *O* divides correctly or of agreement with readings right and wrong of *Q*. He also rejects the recent stemma produced by Büchner, who derives the Italian manuscripts from a point in the tradition earlier than the archetype (*a*) because of the supposed significance and superiority of three readings in the Italian manuscripts. One of these (iv. 220) falls out because Büchner has mistaken the reading of *L* and *A*, which in fact is identical with that of *O* and *Q*; the other two (i. 837 and ii. 1020) are thought to admit of a simpler explanation. In any case the proposed stemma is complicated in its assumptions

and fails to account for the wrong arrangement of iv. 299-347 which is common to the whole tradition.

The few quotations which constitute the indirect medieval tradition are derivable from citations in ancient grammarians still extant, excepting one of Ermenrich (i. 150-6) the text of which is identical with that of the direct tradition (for Ermenrich himself wrote *divinitus*, not *divitiis*) and agrees even in the dislocation of l. 155; also excepting two quotations (i. 152-8, where l. 155 is interestingly omitted, and i. 281-5) found, in a ninth-century hand, in the miscellaneous codex Vat. Reg. lat. 598, a *testimonium* not yet reported by the editors of Lucretius.

The indirect ancient tradition is more extensive and includes thirteen fragments attributed to Lucretius but absent from our text. These last are examined at length: while some might conceivably be accommodated in one or other of the larger lacunae, some are clearly wrong attributions, and of the rest none is free from suspicion. They offer no support to any hypothesis that Lucretius wrote more than six books. Otherwise the ancient *testimonia* supply us with one probably authentic verse missing in the direct tradition (ii. 43a), as well as with a number of correct readings and a correct verse-sequence where the manuscripts of Lucretius are corrupt, but only rarely with a possible variant to a satisfactory reading (e.g. i. 66 *tendere* Nonius; *tollere* MSS.). It is significant that they confirm the presence in our text of two passages (iv. 1-25 and iv. 218-29), both doublets where interpolation has been suspected.

The third and last chapter inquires whether, in a text so evidently corrupted and truncated in the course of transmission, certain other ill-fitting passages are to be accounted for by thinking of losses in our text or perhaps of interpolation, or whether on the other hand they can be more convincingly explained as evidence either of an idiosyncratic style or of provisional treatment by Lucretius himself in the composition of a poem which he did not live to revise finally in all its parts. The author thus involves himself in the truceless battle of the First Proemium as well as of the Fourth, in the question of the plan and order of composition of the six books, in the problem of doublets, and in criticism of the criteria which scholars have applied to this question, not forgetting a recent forlorn attempt to fix the chronology of composition by tracing the crescendo of pessimism in the different books. In general his conclusion is that, excepting obvious corruptions and lacunae, we have the poem more or less as Lucretius left it and that in composing his six books he followed in *linea di massima* the same order in which we have received them. Passages which do not sit square in their context lack his final revision and some of them certainly could have been adjusted by minor alterations. Had he lived, Lucretius would have presented his poem for publication without important additions or changes. Even the 'unfulfilled' promise (v. 155) is to be disposed of by referring it back to ll. 146-7 rather than to ll. 153-4 and by showing Lucretius to have fulfilled it sufficiently to his purpose *posterius*.

In a brief Appendix Pizzani comments on Giancotti's ample study *Il Preludio di Lucrezio*, and announces a more detailed review later.

A summary notice cannot do justice to the close and complicated argument of this comparatively short book. The book will not appease the curiosity and anxiety of every reader, and even one inclined to sympathize with its conclusions in general may not wish to go with it in points of detail. But the look of the poem does agree with the evidence of Jerome in suggesting that Lucretius died



before he could revise it finally, and if this is assumed and if one tries to imagine the problem and process of composing over a long period a poem of comprehensive and coherent argument, one would expect it to have been composed paragraph-wise and expect to find weakness at the joints, provisional positionings, alternative versions. Even with the disposition of the poem more or less clearly conceived from the beginning, Lucretius need not have written it in serial succession or revised it in the same order in which he composed it. The unknowables in the creative process are such that only scholars of suitable temperament, unable to repose in lucid scepticism, will hope to argue themselves into a position close enough to look over the shoulder of Lucretius as he worked and 'watched through the clear nights'.

Textual critics will be able to correct the scatter of misprints in words and misprints or errors in the numerals of references. On p. 93, for example, *corrotta* has been corrupted to *corretta* and on p. 105 *montis* to *montibus*; on p. 87 in the fourth line read IV 220 for VI 220, on p. 135 in the fourth line of the second para. read vv. 127-35 for 136-45, on p. 140 in the fourth line from the bottom of the main text read V for IV, and on p. 141 in the third line of the last para. read 62-145 for 62-154. Metricians will wonder why on p. 95 the version in Macrobius of ii. 144 is not dismissed as unmetrical, or how to scan on p. 107 (footnote) the hexameter-ending *voluere maiora*, and on p. 114 *panaceam ubique salem*, if this is to be considered as an authentic fragment of Lucretius.

University College, Oxford

A. F. WELLS

## AENEID V

R. D. WILLIAMS: P. Vergili Maronis *Aeneidos Liber Quintus*. Edited with a commentary. Pp. xxx+219. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960. Cloth, 20s. net.

THIS new edition of Book v of the *Aeneid* from the Clarendon Press follows the editions of Book vi by Sir Frank Fletcher (1941) and of Book iv by R. G. Austin (1955). The text is the Oxford text of Hirtzel (1900); the editor's wish to depart from this text in a few instances is indicated at the appropriate places in the notes. The editor tells us that in his notes and his introductory matter he has endeavoured to meet the needs of students in the upper forms of schools and in universities, and at the same time to make some contribution to more advanced Virgilian scholarship.

The editor also tells us that he has paid particular attention in his notes to stylistic and metrical features. In so doing he has assembled much useful material, the product of more or less recent scholarship (including his own), which is not available in the hitherto existing commentaries. It seems to me a pity that it is presented piecemeal in notes on individual passages, where its immediate effect is not always beneficial; one would have preferred an organized account of Virgil's practice in these matters, perhaps in the Introduction. But this is easier to suggest than to do.

The editor favours the interpretation and punctuation of ll. 317-18 which F. H. Sandbach advanced in *C.R.* lxxi (1957), pp. 102-3; he recommends a

full stop in l. 317 and then *simul ultima signant, primus abit . . . Nisus*; he translates 'as soon as they begin to tread the last stretch, Nisus goes away in front'.

There are perhaps too many notes in the style of the following: 258 'Servius here affords a good example of how a commentator can press a poet too hard . . .'; 389 'Servius and Donatus miss the point entirely and . . .'; 467 'Henry strangely argues that . . .'. Again, some notes seem disproportionate in their context. *fit Beroe* in l. 620 gets nearly two-thirds of a page of annotation. The accusative in *humeros oleo perfusa* in l. 135 also gets two-thirds of a page, with references to Kühner-Stegmann, Leumann-Hofmann, Ernout-Thomas, Palmer, Page, Austin, Conway, and Maguinness. The plural *vina* in l. 98 gets a page and a quarter, with references to Löfstedt, Marouzeau, Norden, Leumann-Hofmann, and Austin.

Sometimes we miss a note where we should be glad to have one. For instance, the modern boxer's guard is so characteristic a posture and comes so readily to the imagination that a reader is apt to be puzzled by l. 427 (*brachiaque ad superas interritus extulit auras*) unless he gets more help than is afforded by a hint in the note on the following l. 428. The two gauntlets made of the hides of no less than seven oxen, and huge oxen at that, in ll. 404-5 ought surely to excite some remark; else the young student may come to feel that in ancient literature the rules of sense do not apply. In l. 489 *suspendit* and in l. 511 *pendebat* are not words we expect to find applied to the tethered dove; a note here would have been welcome, especially as none is provided by Conington or Page or Mackail.

Prefixed to the text and notes is an Introduction, in which the main propositions advanced are as follows. (1) Virgil was led to make a feature of the Games partly through his love of Homer and partly because games and shows were a subject of topical interest at the time when he was writing. The resulting episode serves to relax the tension between the excitements of Book iv and those of Book vi. Virgil has prevented it from appearing purely incidental by making it an illustration of Aeneas' *pietas* towards his father and thus relating it to one of the main themes of the poem. (2) Virgil's treatment of the Games as a whole is internally more compact and more organic than Homer's. Further comparison in detail illustrates some differences between the Homeric and the 'literary' epic. (3) The way in which Virgil effects the transition into and out of the cheerful atmosphere of the Games is notably skilful. He begins them with a solemn religious ceremony and ends them with a portent and a pageant of 'national' significance. Thus, though the transition to the next episode (the firing of the ships) brings a contrast of mood, it does not involve a sharp alteration in the level of poetic intensity. (4) After the Games, when the ships are fired by the women, the momentary despair that overtakes Aeneas is one of a number of instances of human frailty in him which show that he is no mere puppet of Destiny or textbook example of Roman virtues, at least in the first half of the poem. Following Warde Fowler and others Williams feels that the change in Aeneas from hesitation in the first half of the poem to confidence in the concluding books is due specifically to the vision of the future that he sees in Book vi, rather than to the portents and other reassurances that he receives in Books vii and viii. (5) Williams claims that 'the directness and vigour of narrative and the relative rareness of Alexandrian motifs and descriptions in Book v link it with Virgil's later style'. He discusses the discrepancies between the story of Palinurus' death told in ll. 833-87, and

the account given later by Palinurus himself in Book vi, concluding that the version in the present book is the later of the two. He does not regard as significant the discrepancy between i. 755 ff., where it is the seventh summer since the Trojans sailed from Troy, and v. 626, where it is also the seventh summer though in Book iv a winter appears to intervene.

In the course of the Introduction some true things, as it seems to me, are said about Virgilian poetry and about Virgil's probable method of composition.

I have learned a good deal from this book, and I am sure that many others who share the editor's affection for his author will be grateful to him for it.

Pembroke College, Cambridge

W. A. CAMPS

## LUCAN VII

M. ANNAEI LUCANI: *De Bello Civili Liber VII*. Revised from the edition of J. P. POSTGATE by O. A. W. DILKE. Pp. x+182. Cambridge: University Press, 1960. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

DILKE has considerably expanded Postgate's Introduction, adding a life of Lucan and taking account of the large literature on the topography of Pharsalia. It is a pity that his treatment (pp. 34-39) of Lucan as poet and literary artist is so jejune and unsympathetic: after reading this Introduction an intelligent sixth-former or undergraduate would be entitled to wonder why the poem is worth studying at all. The commentary is still largely Postgate's; Dilke notices later contributions to the problems of the book and has added some notes of his own, mostly on grammatical points. In general the reader for whom this edition is intended will find in it almost all he needs to help him interpret the text; the following observations concern for the most part matters of detail. 36 *quoque* = *etiam*, a sense unknown to Lewis and Short, should receive comment here rather than at 841; 72 *tam longo tempore* is not abl. of time within which but of duration of time (for Lucan's usage cf. C. F. W. Müller, *Synt. des Nom. u. Akk. im Lat.*, p. 104); 172 the spelling *Erechtheus* in the Ovid quotation ought not to have got past the editor's guard—*Orthographica* is now in print again (cf. 675 n., where *Ov. Am.* iii. 10. 5 is quoted as a parallel for *ubicumque*); 387-9 Dilke rejects Housman's *nona aetas* and excision of 388 on historical grounds. His arguments are perhaps more convincing than Axelson's (at *Studien zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik*, pp. 31 ff.); but it is pertinent to observe that historical considerations ought to weigh less heavily in the text of a declamatory poet (cf. Dilke's notes on 392, 868) than the linguistic difficulties of the vulgate, which are here shirked: '*quidquid* seems here to mean "an amount, whatever that may be"'; 464 the note on *forent* is taken from Postgate and is inapposite to the text now printed; 616 for *uertēre* (subj. *tenebrae*) Nutting's 'caused his eyes to roll' may cause some eyebrows to rise; 656 after 658 (Hudson-Williams) seems totally unnecessary; 676 f. a sophistical explanation to avoid emending 677: '*negatum* does not . . . convey an actual denial; Pompey is afraid that he is doomed to die separated from Cornelia, and so is keen to see her now in Lesbos'; 714 for *per moenia* = 'along the walls' Prop. iii. 11. 23 is no parallel—Duff's 'through her gates' is right; 754 ff. *inplebit* (Hudson-Williams) . . . / . . . *harenis*; / *ut rapiant eqs*. This is not without attractions, but gives a very feeble sense to *ut rapiant*. Since rhetoric forbids us to follow Postgate's suggestion

and punctuate heavily between 755 and 756, the traditional text seems preferable; 798 *caelum* = 'the gods' is not exemplified in Lewis and Short, and perhaps deserves explicit recognition. In the Critical Appendix the note (p. 171) on 489 ff. is incompletely adapted from Postgate: the arguments, which are Postgate's, are not against the 'numerical order', but against the order adopted by Hosius and Heitland (Postgate, p. 92). The task of revising other men's work is not an enviable one, and such accidents are prone to happen. On the whole Dilke has done a solid and useful job.

Peterhouse, Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

## CAESAR'S CIVIL WAR

César: *Memorias de la Guerra Civil*. Texto revisado y traducido por SEBASTIÁN MARINER BIGORRA. Vol. i. (Colección Hispánica.) Pp. lxxiii + 87 (mostly double); 2 maps. Barcelona: Ediciones Alma Mater, 1959. Cloth.

This is a beautifully printed edition of Book i of the *Bellum Civile*, intended, it would seem, for the use of Spanish university students.

Bigorra's text is firmly based on those of Klotz and Fabre, with only three minor suggestions of his own: 39. 1 *xxxx* for *lxxx*, 39. 2 *attigunt* <*addiderat*> . . ., and 44. 2 <*peregrino*> *pugnae*—all sensible corrections of passages where the manuscripts' reading is generally recognized to be faulty. One could wish that he had taken a bolder line with some of the other *loci vexati*, e.g. 5. 2, where he prints <*post*> *octo denique menses variarum actionum*, and 6. 7 *ex urbe profisciscuntur* (without lacuna). Neither of these readings has yet been satisfactorily explained, and it would be better in the one case to have recourse to Mommsen's *toto denique emenso spatio suarum actionum*, and in the other to suppose that a reference to the consuls' failure to go through the traditional preliminaries, such as *non auspicati*, has been omitted.

Misprints in the text are few. 9. 1 *liberari* and 31. 3 *in terram* need correction; at 4. 4 and 72. 2 the word-order has been altered without any obvious reason, and an *et* has been inserted after *Alba* 15. 7 without explanation. The apparatus is for the most part reliable, but a trifle bulky, owing to Bigorra's decision to print the readings of du Pontet, Fabre, and Klotz, where they differ from his own. At 11. 2 Meusel's correction *iturus esset* requires an entry in the apparatus.

The text is accompanied by an accurate translation and some explanatory notes. When space is limited and problems numerous, it is not easy to decide what notes are essential. But if room can be found for a note on *hospites* (74. 5), one would expect notes on *sanctius aerarium* 14. 1, on the train of thought which led Caesar to write *itaque* 58. 4, and on Sertorius 61. 3. Some of the notes are mistaken: 6. 4 (additional note iii) there is no suggestion of a general 'anulación' of the tribunician veto on 1 Jan., 49. Note iv on the next section misses the point of *privati*, by which Caesar indicates his contempt for the Lex Pompeia of 52. 48. 3 *ut supra* . . . : it will not do to pass off the lack of previous reference by saying that the situation can be deduced 'con un conocimiento geográfico suficiente'. Few of Caesar's readers would be likely to possess that.



The Introduction, besides giving notes on the manuscript tradition and a well-written account of the Civil War down to the death of Pothinus (which Bigorra regards as a significant and appropriate stopping-point for Caesar's narrative), deals briefly with the *Rechtsfrage* and the problem of composition and publication to which the *B.C.* gives rise. The over-simplification of the problem of the terminal date of Caesar's command which such a brief treatment is bound to entail would cause less misgiving if adequate reference were made to the authorities on which our judgement has to be based; and in stating Caesar's 'claims' it should be emphasized that these were such as he was able to make in later years. Barwick's arguments for an early date of composition and publication are clearly set out, and the objections to each are mentioned. The reader then looks for an exposition of Bigorra's own views, only to be told that 'unfortunately no clear answer to the problem has yet been reached'. Bigorra goes on to outline Rambaud's views on Caesar's wilful distortion of the facts throughout the *Commentarii*, and rightly indicates the distortion to which Rambaud's method itself may lead. But when he proceeds to argue that one must consider the end which propaganda is used to further, he is introducing considerations which are quite irrelevant to the question of the trustworthiness of the *Commentarii* as an historical account.

University of St. Andrews

J. H. SIMON

## CICERO'S *PHILIPPICS*

ANDRÉ BOULANGER, PIERRE WUILLEUMIER: *Cicéron: Discours. Tome xix: Philippiques i-iv. Texte établi et traduit.* (Collection Budé.) Pp. 200 (mostly double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1959. Paper, 9 fr.

THIS volume is sound and reliable, though in the nature of the case it contains nothing very new. The apparatus criticus is clear, the introduction judicious, and the translation excellent. It is good to have these magnificent speeches in so convenient a form.

The most important witness to the text of the *Philippics* is the ninth-century Vaticanus; it might be mentioned that its three columns are a good indication that it is copied from an ancient exemplar. The other manuscripts are derived from a common source, conventionally known as D. The Budé editors list twelve of these manuscripts in their sigla, though not all are cited throughout. The symbol  $\delta$  is used after any reading with substantial support, so that the apparatus is not overloaded; all the same, one hopes that some simplification of the stemma may one day be found possible.

The text contains the following misprints: ii. 57 *noitora* (for *notiora*), ii. 61 *hominum* (for *hominem*), ii. 64 *servitus* (for *servitutis*), ii. 95 *meditare* (for *meditere*), iii. 27 *praeclarem* (for *praeclaram*). At i. 15 V's reading is reported not as *metus* but as *metu*; this appears to be a mistake taken from Clark's first edition. At i. 26 the punctuation *vim, arma: remouete*, which is attributed to Schoell, is at least as old as Lambinus. At ii. 50 the Budé editors' insertion of *rapere* after *explere* was anticipated by Graevius. At ii. 68 *in vestibulo* was proposed by Muretus, not Mueller.

Occasionally the Budé editors may not have considered prose-rhythm

sufficiently. In the following list the Budé reading is put first, followed by the rhythmically superior reading. i. 29 *publicam meritorum* V8; *publicam fama meritorum* codd. Colotiani, Isidorus. i. 35 *qui beatum fuisse putant* V; *qui beatum putant* D (cf. i. 31 *beatum putant*). iii. 21 *iudicari ducibus* V; *ducibus iudicari* D. iii. 23 *et minis expellere* Cobet; *et minis mortis expellere(t)* VD. iii. 34 *opprimere urbem potuisset* V; *urbem opprimere potuisset* D. iv. 13 *natura omnibus proposuit* V; *omnibus natura proposuit* D.

A few other points may be mentioned. i. 12 *quis autem unquam tanto damno senatorem coegit aut quid est ultra pignus aut multam?* The transmitted text can be translated, and editors do not comment; but *est* seems weak for this highly polished speech. Should one perhaps toy with *exactum est* or something of the kind? i. 14 *non modo voce nemo L. Pisoni consularis, sed ne vultu quidem adsensus est*. The Budé editors deserve credit for reading *consularis* with some of the D group, where both Clark and Schoell accept V's *consulari*. i. 34 *de quo iam audisti multa ex me eaque saepissime*. Faernus's *eaque* (*aquae* V; om. D) is generally read. His other suggestion *atque* has been ignored by editors, but is worth considering; V reads *aquae* for *atque* at Pis. 70 and Phil. ii. 103 (the former passage, though in a different script, may have been written by the same scribe).

ii. 8 *sit hoc inhumanitatis*. Thus the Budé editors with V; for D's *inhumanitatis tuae* one may compare Pis. 47 *sit hoc infelicitatis tuae*. ii. 68 *illa in vestibulo rostra spolia cum aspexisti*. Surely Orelli was right to delete *spolia*. ii. 84 *sudat, pallet, quidlibet, modo ne nauseet, faciat quod in porticu Minucia fecit*. Surely *nauseet* is a gloss, as Cobet suggested. ii. 101 *cui tu urbi minitaris. utinam conere . . .* Editors would improve the balance of this passage if they printed a colon after *minitaris*. ii. 106 *sed comminus inter omnis constabat neminem esse resalutatum*. The Budé editors surprisingly accept Schmidt's *comminus* (*cum vimus* V; *simul* (*unum*) *cinus* D), but they translate 'il n'en était pas moins de notoriété'. ii. 111 *quid ad haec tandem? exspecto enim eloquentiam tuam*. Thus the Budé editors, and Schoell as well; but *tuam* (read by the first hand of a single manuscript) has no authority and produces a regrettable run of iambs. If a supplement were needed (and this is doubtful) I should rather suggest *vestram* (which might have been lost after *-uentiam*); Cicero goes on to mention Antony's grandfather, the orator.

iii. 9 *L. Brutus regem superbum non tulit; D. Brutus sceleratum atque impium regnare patietur?* The Budé editors rightly read thus with D (not V, as they state); Clark and Schoell accept V's *patietur Antonium*. iii. 22 *en cur magister eius ex oratore arator factus [sit], possideat in agro publico campi Leontini duo milia iugerum immunia*. The Budé editors follow Faernus in deleting *sit*; if a deletion were made at all (and it hardly seems compulsory) it would be better for rhythmical reasons to delete *factus sit*; cf. iii. 31 *ille autem, ex myrmillone dux, . . . quas effecit strages*. iii. 28 *hodierno die . . . in possessione[m] libertatis pedem ponimus*. The Budé editors read *possessione* with Ferrarius (*possessionem* VD), but the accusative is probably right. At *Cascin*. 39 there is a substantial authority for *in possessionem vestigium fecero*, though *possessione* is read by the Turin palimpsest. For the legal phrase *in possessionem esse* cf. *I.L.S.* 206, 8391, Kühner-Stegmann, *Lat. Gramm.* i. 594. iv. 3 *sunt enim facta eius immortalitatis, nomen aetatis*. The Budé editors translate 'ses actions appartiennent en effet à l'immortalité, son renom à notre époque'. But *nomen aetatis* surely means 'the name *puer* is applicable only to his years, though not to his character'; cf. xiii. 24 *est istuc quidem nomen aetatis*.

## THE MANUSCRIPTS OF VITRUVIUS

PIERRE RUFFEL, JEAN SOUBIRAN: *Recherches sur la tradition manuscrite de Vitruve*. (Annales de la Faculté de Lettres de Toulouse, ix. 3.) Pp. 154. Toulouse: Faculté des Lettres, 1959. Paper. not known.

THE present work is a preliminary study for an edition of Vitruvius which Professors Ruffel and Soubiran are preparing. Indeed, as will be seen, it is more than that.

That all existing manuscripts of the *De Architectura* go back to a common archetype has long been recognized. There has been little agreement on the number of separate families, i.e. the number of copies made from the archetype. Rose in his first edition (Leipzig, 1867) proposed a bifid stemma—EG opposed to H. In his second edition (Leipzig, 1899) he maintained the same scheme, treating the tenth-century manuscript discovered at Sélestat in 1878 (S) as a member of the family of H. Krohn in his *Quaestiones Vitruvianae* (Berlin, 1896) saw that S was not a copy of H, though he was somewhat vague in describing its exact status; in his edition (Leipzig, 1912) he returned to Rose's bifid stemma. H. Degering, in a series of articles and reviews published in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* between 1900 and 1915, argued that there are five distinct families: not only S, but also Vat. Regin. 1328 (V) and 2079 (W), are descended from separate copies of the archetype, which received various marginal additions and suffered material damage between the successive transcriptions. Finally, in 1931 Granger in his Loeb edition put the clock back by treating all surviving manuscripts as descendants of Harleianus 2767 (H.)

Ruffel and Soubiran adhere to Degering's view, which they support with a mass of detailed evidence based on collation of Books i and ix entire and check collations of other passages in sixteen manuscripts. Some of these—including, oddly enough, W and V, which Degering recognized as representatives of distinct families in 1915 (*B. Ph. W.* xxv. 419)—have never been collated before. All this is very competently done, with abundance of good sense and caution, and the crucial 'Trennfehler' of the five families are summarized on pp. 55–57. In the course of this examination, the authors build up a picture of the archetype more detailed than has hitherto been possible: it had many glosses and marginal supplements, but it cannot be proved to have had true variant readings; it was in an insular hand, with 33–39 Teubner lines to a page; it had undergone various mishaps at the hands of binders, and so on. On pp. 33–38 and 80–82 highly plausible reconstructions of certain passages of the archetype are made, which the authors modestly put forward as hypotheses.

Degering's five families seem to be now definitely established. What the authors have not done is to estimate the degree and direction of contamination between the various families. A glance at the note on pp. 82–91, on the relations between S and V and between H and W, will show that there is a good deal of contamination. On pp. 98–107 the authors discuss, with their customary precision and good sense, the sources of the corrections in the sixteen manuscripts before them, and conclude that 'on n'établit pas solidement les contaminations entrevues par les critiques précédents'. But what we want to know about are corrections to the exemplars of our manuscripts, not to the manuscripts themselves.

In their second section (pp. 113-44) Ruffel and Soubiran deal with a problem of no interest to editors of Vitruvius but of great interest to students of his influence in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, that of the descendants of Harleianus 2767. The great majority of surviving manuscripts belong to this family. With cool competence they identify 'Trennfehler' and 'Leitfehler', and arrange the ten manuscripts collated by them in four sub-families, of which a stemma appears on p. 144. But they know of some seventy manuscripts of Vitruvius which they have not examined (p. 148). Most of these, perhaps all, are descendants of H. One wonders whether there is any point in working out in such detail the relations of a small and virtually random selection from the Harleian family, and whether the authors would not have been better employed making test collations of at least the older among this mass of witnesses. In these days of the microfilm it is technically easy enough. Who knows whether a new independent family might not turn up? After all, V is a fifteenth-century manuscript. In fairness to the authors, it should be said that they are fully aware of this possibility (p. 148).

The *recensio codicum*, difficult though it is, is among the least of the problems facing an editor of Vitruvius (on this point cf. the remarks of Degering, *B. Ph. W.* xxxii [1912], 581). However, Ruffel and Soubiran have displayed in this preliminary study a combination of scholarship and common sense which augurs well for their forthcoming edition.

There are very few slips: on p. 73 the supine *potum* is treated as derived from *potare*; and on p. 76 the authors accept as Vitruvian the construction *probare c.* infin. equivalent to *se probare* or *probari*, when they would have been wiser to treat it as an error of the archetype.

University College, London

ROBERT BROWNING

## GAIUS

M. DAVID, H. L. W. NELSON: *Gai Institutionum Commentarii iv* mit philologischem Kommentar herausgegeben. Text (2. Lief.), Kommentar (2. Lief.). (Studia Gaiana, vol. ii, iii.) Pp. 48-96, 177-342. Leiden: Brill, 1960. Paper, fl. 25.

THE second instalment of the new edition of Gaius (on the first see *C.R.* lxi. [1955], 287-9) comprises the text of i. 157-ii. 122 and the commentary upon i. 137a-ii. 123. All reviewers of the first two fascicules were unanimous in praising the acute scholarship and sound judgement of Professors David and Nelson, and even those whose views on Gaius were most often impugned were none the less enthusiastic, e.g. S. Solazzi, *I.V.R.A.* vi (1955), 324-30.

The harvest of observations on the language of Gaius and on later Latin in general naturally dwindles as the commentary advances. But there are still many good things in the present volume, e.g. the discussion of types of ellipse (pp. 186-8), of the form *ueniri* (pp. 195-7), of the uses of *nam*, in which the editors reject the over-elaborate classification proposed by Brassloff, *Vocabularium Iurisprudentiae Romanae*, iv. 1 ff., and the conclusions drawn by some scholars from the occurrence of alleged post-Antonine uses of *nam* (pp. 209-14), of *modo* = now (pp. 229-30), of postponed *si* in conditional clauses (pp. 273-4), of *adversus* and *adversum* (pp. 288-9), of *et (que)* . . . *aut* after negatives (pp. 330-1).

The text follows the Verona palimpsest (V) more closely than has been the



practice of recent editors. Often this conservatism is completely justified: examples of this are the defence of *evaserit* (V) against *effugerit* (*Dig.* and Justinian's *Inst.*) in ii. 67, based on an examination of post-classical prose usage (pp. 279-90), and the defence of *at* in ii. 72, similarly based on a detailed study of linguistic usage (pp. 282-5). Dare a classical scholar suggest that jurists have sometimes condemned a usage as unclassical, and even rejected as interpolations the passages in which it occurs, on insufficient evidence? Be that as it may, David and Nelson examine all such arguments with a coldly critical eye. In other passages they seem perhaps too ready to retain—even at the cost of conjecture—readings of V which seem more likely to be interpolations. An example is i. 183, where *scilicet ut (et V) in provinciis a praeside provinciae tutor petendus sit* is retained. Kniep and Solazzi ('Glosse a Gaio i', *Studi in onore di S. Riccobono*, i. 185), rejected this phrase as a gloss, and the argument against it has recently been most cogently developed by F. Wieacker ('Textstufen klassischer Juristen' [*Abhandl. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 3<sup>o</sup> Folge, Nr. 45], 1960, 191) in a closely reasoned study of the context. However, David and Nelson do not make a principle of conservatism. We find them using convincing linguistic arguments in the defence of conjectures (not usually their own) in i. 152, ii. 47, ii. 59, ii. 119, and many other passages. Similarly they defend the indirect tradition against V on occasion, e.g. i. 159 i. 165, etc.

There are two general problems concerning the text of Gaius, which occasionally blur into one another. The first is whether the Constantinopolitan manuscripts used by Justinian's commissioners, where they can be reconstructed, offer a better text than the Verona palimpsest (whose western origin is a plausible hypothesis, but no more). The second is whether by the early fourth century, when the two recensions are supposed to have diverged, there had been wholesale interference with the text of the *commentarii* by way of epitomization and interpolation. The editors' final answer to these questions will not emerge until they deal with the passages in Books iii and iv for which we have the evidence of the papyri (*P. Oxy.* 2103, a fragment of a roll, dated mid- or late-third century; *P.S.I.* 1182, a fragment of a parchment codex of the fourth century). But in the meantime it can be provisionally inferred that they believe the Constantinopolitan text to have been in principle no better than the Verona palimpsest, and that they regard the surviving text as being substantially what Gaius wrote. Both these questions have given rise to an immense and, to the classical scholar, forbidding and inaccessible literature, much of which appeared to assume the very things it set out to prove. The outcome was sometimes to present the text of the *Commentarii* as a kind of patchwork, most of which was the work of 'die flüchtige Hand des Interpolators'. Why anyone should rewrite Gaius' handbook without at the same time bringing it up to date by referring to post-Antonine legislation has always been a puzzle. It is to be hoped that David and Nelson will discuss these problems systematically in their preface, and not merely leave their principles to be inferred from their practice. The history of the transmission of juristic texts, on which we are sometimes very well informed, is of absorbing interest to scholars of textual history in general. For a recent summary of problems and methods cf. F. Wieacker, *op. cit.*, pp. 9-24, where full references are given to the literature.

## JURISTIC TEXTS

FRANZ WIEACKER: *Textstufen klassischer Juristen*. (Abh. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl., 3 F., Nr. 45. Pp. 471. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960. Paper, DM. 48.

THE course of the present century has witnessed, in the study of surviving Roman legal materials, a considerable deepening in subtlety and rigour of criticism, in connexion with which the name of Fritz Schulz must ever be in mind. In 1916, when interpolationist study was still broadly concentrated upon the *Digest* and based upon the axiom that what was not classical was Justinianic (or should one perhaps reverse that order?), he produced his *Einführung in das Studium der Digesten*; the first part dealt with the principles, criteria, and materials of criticism—manuscript variations, gloss as distinct from substantive alteration, etc.—while, in the second part, their use was demonstrated in the exposure of alterations in the texts on selected topics of substantive law. To the same kind of study, essentially, belongs Chiazzese's *Confronti Testuali* (1933). But attention gradually shifted back to the pre-Justinian history of the classical texts and the alterations and revisions that they are alleged to have undergone before ever reaching the hands of Tribonian and his associates. So again Schulz, in his *Roman Legal Science* (1946), refers, almost without comment, to post-classical editions, revisions, etc., early and late, of classical works.

This new and important work by Wieacker, the distinguished Romanist of Göttingen, is a kind of '*Einführung*' and '*Confronti*' in one for the present stage of textual study. The first part surveys the development of scholarship and makes the case for study not only of the fate, general and separate, of legal scholarship in East and West, but also of the history of the texts themselves, in the argument for pre-Justinianic modification of the *ipsissima verba* of the masters; for instance, the significance of changes in the book form from roll to *codex* with further possibilities of copyists' errors, contributing to the need for revision of texts in the period A.D. 240–530. The second part considers in turn the history of particular types of works, and of the particular works themselves, during the period—elementary works, commentaries on the edict and *ad Sabinum*, problem literature, etc.—utilizing the material of the first part in discussing not only the *Digest* but also other surviving material of the great classical writers.

Wieacker is clearly a great admirer of Schulz—as, indeed, who should not be? But it must, with all respect to the memory of that great scholar, be conceded that Schulz was at times radical and arbitrary in his assertions. Wieacker, however, has produced an admirable, restrained, and careful survey, abundantly documented and essentially moderate and cautious in his conclusions on the revision or re-editing of the works which he examines.

There are, of course, items on which one feels moved to differ from the illustrious author. One example must suffice for this short notice:—the reviewer sees no reason why *Inst.* iii. 6. 4 should not be the work of the compilers of the *Institutes* themselves (who were, after all, preparing a manual for the commencing law student) without suspecting, as does Wieacker, a post-classical school production, intended for clarifying the classical system of relationship seen in *D.* 38. 10. 1. 6 (pp. 228 ff.). But, of course, much inevitably

depends, in these matters, upon the degree of one's enthusiasm for the current trend of scholarship. And if the work has a flaw, it is this—that it assumes the correctness of modern doctrine, and often hypotheses, on the post-classical experiences of classical literature. The reviewer is not disinclined to go along in the same general direction; but he would have liked to see more attention given to those—and notably Buckland—whose attitude to interpolationism generally, Justinianic or earlier, was somewhat more conservative.

That said, however, it must also be said again that this is an important book, indispensable to the Roman lawyer and far from devoid of interest to any student of textual criticism.

University of Glasgow

J. A. C. THOMAS

## HISTORICAL STUDIES

ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO: *Secondo Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici*. Pp. 499. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1960. Paper, L. 6,000.

THE second volume of Professor Momigliano's collected papers—a third is promised—is doubly welcome because it contains several not readily accessible elsewhere. The papers reprinted here fall into the following groups:—(a) on ancient writers, e.g. Herodotus, the *Historia Augusta*, Cassiodorus and some contemporaries, the *Origo Gentis Romanae*, Lycophron's *Alexandra*, etc., or on ancient views of the causes of wars and of seapower; (b) on modern scholars or historians, e.g. Scipione Maffei, Burckhardt, Mommsen, de Sanctis, or on classical subjects as treated in modern times, e.g. *Erodoto e la storiografia moderna*, Perizonius, Niebuhr and the *Character of Early Roman Tradition*, and essays on the idea of Caesarism, on the study of ancient history 1946–54, on *L'Eredità della filologia antica e il metodo storico*; with these I may perhaps connect an eminently sensible paper on historical method; (c) some miscellaneous papers on historical problems and reviews of some important books.

This analysis of the contents shows that, despite the book's title, Momigliano has much to say about classical antiquity in its own right, and not merely on the history of classical scholarship. That subject might indeed seem to be quite distinct, to be part of the history of the periods in which the classical scholars discussed wrote, rather than of the periods to which their studies refer, and to demand knowledge (which Momigliano possesses) even more of the intellectual climate of their times, which partly determined their interests and opinions, than of classical antiquity itself. It has its own fascination, well illustrated by some of Momigliano's essays, yet it might be thought a side-track, diverting the classical scholar from direct scrutiny of the evidence for his own particular concerns. I am not sure that Momigliano would agree. It would often seem that he has entangled the two subjects, as if we must always look at problems of ancient history first through the eyes of all who have previously tried to solve them.

What can be gained from this procedure? A wide knowledge of what has been studied in the past, coupled with breadth of interests and vision, makes it easier to discover new problems, new lines of inquiry (cf. pp. 26–27, 343–8, etc.). It makes Momigliano rightly distrustful of 'those adventurous syntheses

and over-acute conjectures which are a recurring malady of classical studies'; this warning in the preface is often repeated, and his favourite verdict seems to be 'Non Liqueat'; students of archaic Greek history and commentators on epigraphic fragments should note. Interpretations of past history or historians are often influenced by the conditions of the present—Momigliano's essay on the idea of Caesarism reminds me of Professor Geyl's fine book on Napoleon and his historians—and it may be that if we are more fully conscious of the anachronisms and errors into which our predecessors have fallen under such influences, we shall be better placed to limit the subjectivity which must in some measure distort our own interpretations. (I cannot help thinking that Momigliano himself is rather anachronistic in finding ancient treatments of the causes of war so unsatisfactory. If war was an 'ever present reality in Greek life', indeed in antiquity generally, it was not only natural but correct if ancient writers were satisfied with what may seem to us superficial explanations for particular wars. It was perhaps not till the nineteenth century that peace could be regarded as normal, and that deep-seated causes for wars needed to be found. In antiquity it is peace that may most need complex explanations.)

Momigliano's method requires formidable erudition. Of course he commands it; witness the footnotes and immense bibliographies. So much learning would turn most of us into 'poring scholiasts',

A lumber room of books in every head  
For ever reading, never to be read.

Not Momigliano; even in English he writes with elegance and felicity that few natives manage; he can bring out with discrimination the essence of old problems (e.g. the *Historia Augusta*) or call our attention to new ones; he is a master of minutiae, but has not lost the power of imaginative grasp over the mentality of a bygone age (see the paper on Cassiodorus). Yet it is not always easy to see how far even he is served by incessant preoccupation with what almost every one before him has written. There is a clear discussion, with the evidence presented, of the hypothesis that ballads formed part of the tradition for early Roman history. What is added, essential to a decision, by reviewing what Perizonius or Niebuhr thought? It would certainly be unwise to prescribe Momigliano's diet to scholars of weaker digestions. There is no branch of knowledge in which progress is not made by men who stand on the shoulders of their often abler predecessors. But progress is most conspicuous in the natural sciences, and the natural scientist does not need to consume his time with study of errors or conjectures made in the past, nor even to read all the works in which basic discoveries were originally set forth. He can make his own departure from modern books or articles which set out what is now known or accepted and give the reasons or evidence. Historians can clearly never attain to this bliss. But must they be clogged by injunctions to master all the 'literature' on their subjects? Is any scholar helped by such bibliographies as the *Cambridge Ancient History* provides? There is an acute problem here which Momigliano is able to evade only because of his abnormal capacity for absorption. The most useful works (other than those few whose synoptic and imaginative power for ever preserve them from oblivion) are such as give the available evidence most fully (as Busolt's *Gr. Gesch.* did it in its day) and, next to them, those in which particular interpretations are most cogently argued; but in each category such works can fall into just neglect as they are superseded. It is surely the duty



of the experts in each field to tell us to read only the minimum needed for knowledge and understanding, and not (as they so often do) to pile up references to authors who repeat or endorse (with perhaps some variety of nuance) the same opinions based on the same facts—or the same dearth of facts.

Oriel College, Oxford

P. A. BRUNT

## THE GREEK STATE

VICTOR EHRENBERG: *The Greek State*. Pp. vii+280. Oxford: Blackwell, 1960. Cloth, 36s. net.

DR. EHRENBERG himself assumes responsibility for the translation of this work from German, and since the English version incorporates additions and corrections, it may be taken as the most up-to-date and authoritative exposition of his views on the subjects treated. In Part I (pp. 5-131) he deals with the *poleis*, their origin, character and mutual relations (including *koina*), in Part II (pp. 135-240) with the Hellenistic monarchies. Evidence is cited only occasionally in the text, but there are over 20 pages of notes, mainly bibliographical, with some important critical remarks. The index is admirably complete and useful.

Ehrenberg proposes 'to find out what is typical' by 'abstractions and generalizations' (p. 4), and he often writes of rules and exceptions. Historical inductions are well enough when they are grounded on a sufficient number of instances. Our ignorance of antiquity may often commend prudent reserve. How many instances do we know where tyranny paved the way for democracy (*contra* pp. 46-47)? Ehrenberg thinks that a privilege granted by Antiochus III to the Jews was probably rare (214). It is known because Josephus recorded it. No temple-state besides Jerusalem has left us such a chronicler. There was surely no professional bureaucracy in any Hellenistic kingdom but Egypt (*pace* p. 180: Ehrenberg's wise reservations on p. 262 deserved prominence in the text). In general he is rightly wary of generalizing from Ptolemaic Egypt to other Hellenistic states, but much of what he writes on democracy depends on evidence from Athens, and perhaps cities that simply copied her.

His treatment of the *polis* tends to be rather formalistic. He seems, for instance to find the main difference between oligarchy and democracy in the degree to which political privileges were extended to all the citizens (p. 47). Here I miss a generalization, which would surely be justified, that oligarchy was usually rule by the propertied class in their own interest (Hellenistic Rhodes was perhaps an exception, Strabo 653), and democracy rule by the poor in their own interest. Hence 'the most passionate civil wars' which he mentions but whose class character he does not stress. Aristotle's shrewd observation that a strong, mediating middle class made for stability (as in fourth-century Athens) would have borne repeating. There is really not enough on the social and economic background in Part I, a pity, as Ehrenberg knows it so well.

Again, it is a half-truth to say that 'in direct democracy the people itself was the ruler' (58). Of course the Assembly retained ultimate control, but a mass meeting must have guidance. It did not come from the officials: Ehrenberg

writes well on the routine character of their jobs (68 ff.) and does not overstate the importance of the *strategoi*. But he makes too much of the Athenian council (61 ff.). Five hundred average citizens, chosen by lot, could not have 'directed foreign policy' (64) or anything else; here, as elsewhere, their deliberations were preliminary (Thuc. v. 45) and their views could be ignored (Dem. xix. 35). They too needed leadership. The orators, or demagogues, provided it. They required for success a comprehensive grasp of the resources and interests of their own and other cities (Ar. *Rhet.* i. 4), and their influence depended on constant readiness to advise on all manner of questions (cf. Aeschin. iii. 220). It was a full-time career, with power, fame, and even enrichment (which public opinion tolerated within limits, Hyp. c. Dem. 25) as the prizes. Like modern politicians, they stood to lose the public confidence (and not just at five-yearly intervals), a sufficient penalty for ambitious men. It is then not enough to dismiss a class but for whom democracy could not have survived a year, by observing that 'they held no office and therefore were without any legal responsibility' (71). Even that is not quite true; see Tod 44 and think of ostracism and the many *graphai paranomon* that made orators as such responsible. (Ehrenberg's account on p. 57 of law-making in the fourth century seems incorrect; see Hignett, *Hist. of Ath. Const.* 299; Busolt, *Gr. St. K.*<sup>2</sup> 1011-13.) And successful politicians were inevitably elected to some offices and laid themselves open to legal charges that rarely represented the real gravamen of the accusation. Many of them, from Miltiades to Demosthenes, might have envied the honourable retirement of the Earl Attlee, K.G.

*Auctoritas* as well as *potestas* merits attention in Greek, as in Roman, affairs; herein lay the basis of Pericles' power (*ἀξίωμα*), which his successful and prolonged tenure of the *strategia* only strengthened. So too at Sparta: Ehrenberg perhaps overrates the real influence of *gerontes* (54) and ephors (67)—the former, as Aristotle saw, might be senile, and the latter were commonly nobodies—and does not see that the machinery of government could be manipulated by men whose policy, character, and abilities gave them authority, the kings at times (67), but also a Brasidas or Lysander.

Ehrenberg does not write for the tiro in scholarship, especially in Part I, where his comments, often allusive and compressed, sometimes obscure, presuppose acquaintance with the evidence: the book could have been better if it had been longer. The fruit of a lifetime of research and reflection must command the respect of students of Greek political institutions; and he has much that is wise (e.g. his insistence on the *ἀνδρες πόλις* theme) and suggestive. But his treatment often resembles a postcard reproduction of a large picture, which indicates yet blurs the richness and intricacy of the original: we sigh for life-sized details, which alone can reveal the style and genius of the artist. It is, for instance, tantalizing to be told that in the *polis* political groups arose, which 'with some justification may be called "parties"' (30). Part II is much more explicit and lucid. The analysis of ruler cult, which does not lose sight of the Oriental background, is especially excellent for its judicious balance and caution. He has provided a good introduction, from which even beginners can profit, to Hellenistic political institutions.

The book deserved better binding; some pages of the review copy fell out after a few hours of use.

## HELLENISTIC CULTURE

MOSES HADAS: *Hellenistic Culture, Fusion and Diffusion*. Pp. vi+324. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1959. Cloth, 35s. net.

THIS book offers both more and less than its title indicates. It is very much less than a description of the cultural life of the Hellenistic world, and at the same time it is very much concerned with certain aspects of the survival of ideas which the author believes to have been prevalent in the Hellenistic world (cf. p. 1).

The work is in effect a study of Judaic influence on Greek thought and writing, and eventually on Roman thought, and (to a less extent) of Greek thought on intertestamentary Hebrew writing. A few preliminary remarks regarding the choice and treatment of the theme as a whole are necessary.

1. Hadas is not concerned to any great extent with the status of individuals, with the common man, his environment and particular aspects of his daily existence; for instance, the frequency or rarity of mixed marriages. However, any process which removes cultural, no less than racial, barriers between persons of different nationalities must form the foundation of the study of intellectual interaction, unless this interaction, as expressed in literature, is not typical of its environment; and if it is not, it loses interest in a general context.

2. The essential restriction of the field to Hebrew influences is historically paradoxical, for Palestinian Jewry is very far from being a characteristic region of the non-Greek part of the Hellenistic world—not least because it was a population with a developed literature and with international contacts through the Diaspora. A picture of the fusion of the Hellenistic world and of the power of Greek modes of thought and living to invade other cultures, must include other aspects of the problem, both geographical and cultural (for instance, the hellenization of the Italian merchants resident in the East, and of the native populations of Asia Minor and Egypt).

3. Hadas regards the culture of the age as typified by, and reflected in, a process of fusion. However, the history of any society consists not only of its absorption of foreign bodies and ideas, but also of static or traditional elements. A picture of a culture which portrays only one aspect of these two opposed phenomena is more than biased: it is very incomplete. This is especially true of the Hellenistic world: in the first half of the third century B.C., when the eastern Mediterranean had assumed the main cultural and political outlines which it was to maintain for over two hundred years, the traditional elements in Greek life (even in the new cities) were extremely strong, particularly in cult and civic life, the two main aspects of Greek existence; and it does not seem likely that the outlook was much changed at this time in either respect. Gradually the picture altered, intermarriage increased, restrictions on citizenship were slightly relaxed, non-civic settlements with looser ties developed, and in certain respects the purely Greek picture took on foreign colours—though not universally, for within the cities the old forms of civic life retained their vigour for centuries. But, by and large, the survival of Greek life in its traditional forms, slightly ossified, it may be, but still with blood in its veins, remains the dominant feature of the Hellenistic world. On the frontiers, and wherever

special circumstances encouraged it, racial fusion occurred, and gradually spread throughout the Greek world, though, even so, the homelands of the Greek cities were little if at all affected by this process, which was much more marked under the Roman Empire than earlier.

4. The value of any study of the Hellenistic world must, on account of the last consideration, depend very largely on the ability of the author to consider his material chronologically in the first place. The width of the Hellenistic horizon, and the depth of its landscape, demand, for their effective mastery, a chronological approach, and the impossibility of acquiring this at more than a few isolated points is the reason why no wholly satisfying history of this world can be written in the present state of our knowledge. Nevertheless, there can be no justification for the method followed by Hadas, who, taking as his province the whole of later Antiquity in both the eastern and western Mediterranean, at times invokes material separated by half a millennium to support a single argument. This procedure may on occasions be harmless or even justified when treating those static elements in post-classical civilization already discussed, but it is unjustifiable in the field chosen by Hadas.

5. Hadas makes almost no allowance for the contemporary existence of similar but unconnected phenomena, even though the field in which he is working is very large and composed of many different units, foreign in many ways to each other. The notion that similarity of expression or of outlook necessarily implies a causal relationship, though easy to apply, is surely the reverse of historical.

These introductory comments are an attempt to focus the picture of the Hellenistic world and the picture given by Hadas. We see that he has given us a very much smaller picture than might at first sight have been supposed. We may now consider the general drift of his argument.

Hadas writes sensibly (chs. i-iv) on the Greek-Barbarian polarity before the Hellenistic period and its gradually diminishing significance in the face both of external developments (Alexander's conquests) and of theoretical teaching (Isocrates, the Cynics), and emphasizes how this paved the way for the ecumenical element in Hellenistic civilization. With this part of the book there is not much need to quarrel: Hadas gives a lively and reasonably unconventional picture of the various forces operating in the Greek world in favour of the demolition of barriers: some chronological vagueness and a few inaccuracies are less significant here than in other sections.

It is with the next section that Hadas reaches his main thesis, and it is from this point onward that one's scepticism increases. Chapter vii, 'Plato the Hellenizer', seeks to establish that 'he was the most important single intellectual factor in the process of Hellenization and that his is the major responsibility for shaping the east's eventual contribution to the west'. As Platonic works in Jewish literature he cites, among those written in Greek, Philo, the Wisdom of Solomon (but though the elements of Greek philosophy in Wisdom are undoubted, there are some Stoic elements which argue against accepting Plato as an immediate source), and 4 Maccabees, which he regards as modelled on the *Gorgias*. On the Hebrew side he finds Platonic influence in the Talmudic method of argument, and even in the whole principle of Talmudic legislation. Here, as throughout, possibilities, faint or strong, are elevated to the rank of established facts.

The next chapter discusses 'Barbarian Apologetics', i.e. claims of kinship



with Greeks (e.g. in the letter of Jonathan Maccabaeus to Sparta), and, in more general terms, the need felt by non-Greeks to maintain the antiquity of their own civilization in the face of the new conquerors—as exemplified, for instance, in the works of Manetho and Berossus. In this connexion Hadas notices the Judaeo-Hellenistic historians and poets, Demetrius, Eupolemus, Artapanus and Philo the Elder, and Theodotus and Ezekiel, and emphasizes that the legend of Moses, with its strange mixture of Biblical tradition and romantic legend, owes much to the same Hellenistic environment as the Alexander Romance. In all this section (as elsewhere) he is heavily dependent on M. Braun's *History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature* (Oxford, 1938).

Chapter ix discusses 'Exotics in the main stream'—hellenized orientals who wrote and taught in Greek, Zeno of Citium, the Tarsan Stoics, Posidonius and the Gadarene group. In each instance Hadas stresses possible oriental elements in their surviving work, not convincingly in all cases. Thus in his treatment of Menippus, he claims that the interweaving of prose and verse, a characteristic feature of his work, is 'a well-established Semitic form', and concludes: 'If it [the Arabic *maqama*] in which the same intermingling is found was as old as Menippus, we should have an example of a hellenised easterner contributing a native property to the general literary tradition.' But how orientalized was Menippus? And how likely to be influenced by such a tradition even if it did exist? In Chapter xi on 'Drama and Diatribe' we see the reverse process at work. Hadas considers the influence of Greek tragedy on Hebrew literature and in particular on Job, and decides (*post alios*) that in form, and still more in substance, that work derives from the world of Greek tragedy, and probably from the *Prometheus Vincit*. Similarly Ecclesiastes shows awareness of a Cynic *diatribe*. In none of these three instances—Menippus, Job, and Ecclesiastes—is the penetration of Greek by Hebrew and vice versa more than a hypothesis. In the chapter on 'Love, Triangular and Pure' Hadas accepts the opinion of Braun, *op. cit.*, that the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, as recounted in the Testament of Joseph, derives indirectly from the *Hippolytus* of Euripides, and claims that the author of The Song of Songs, with its pastoral erotic songs 'learned directly from the Theocritean tradition', and that the famous description of the body of the beloved derives, as a literary device, from the Greek. More grotesque, however, is the claim that the story of Judith and Holophernes, with its theme of a beleaguered city, deprived of its water-supply, is derived directly from the account of Datis' siege of Lindos in the *Lindian Chronicle*: 'It is hard not to believe that the stories are somehow connected, and if that is the case then even without the chronological factor, i.e. that the Greek story is older than the Hebrew, Judith is clearly a barbarization, ethically and artistically, of the Greek story, not the other way round.' I find this almost incredible.

The chapter of 'Aretalogies and Martyrdom' contains a further example of the same type of rash association of similar motives: Lucian's story in the *Vera Historia* about the adventures of the ship in the belly of the whale is said to be closely allied to the story of Jonah—'whether or not the stories of a man inside a big fish stem from a common source, it seems that the literary modes do have a more than accidental affinity'. The next chapter, on 'Cult and Mystery', though for the most part concerned with the familiar aspects of syncretism and mystery-religions, also shows the same preoccupation; here the view is expressed that Neopythagoreanism 'touched not merely individual

thinkers in the Judaeo-Christian tradition, but substantially affected the main stream of that tradition'. This section is based on I. Levy's work, *La Légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine*, the thesis of which, that Alexandrian Judaism, Pharisaism, and Essenism were all penetrated by neo-Pythagorean notions about the after-life etc., Hadas attempts to revive (following Dupont-Sommer) in the light of *The Manual of Discipline* and the organization of the community at Qumran as revealed by the excavations ('The communal organization and the strict rules for its administration can hardly be explained otherwise than as direct influences of Pythagoreanism' (p. 195)), and he does not doubt that this in turn acted on early Christianity.

The final chapters attempt to demonstrate the existence of the same Judaeo-Greek amalgam in Roman literature and the Roman view of the elect status of the Roman people and of the divine mission of the Roman Emperor. The first task, the demonstration of a Judaeo-Greek element in Roman literature, is launched with the aid of Virgil's fourth *Eclogue*. Virgil, Horace, and Tibullus are all regarded as familiar with the *Sibylline Oracles*, while concerning Horace Hadas accepts the view of Dornseiff that he was well read in the Septuagint, and claims him as an agent, like Virgil, for the 'assimilation of eastern modes in the west'. Moreover, not only is Virgil's conception of Aeneas based on a Scriptural pattern; Seneca is involved in the same Judaeo-Greek tradition: after listing the parallels between his writings and the New Testament, Hadas concludes: 'No one can assert that Seneca and men of similar intellectual interests did not know the Septuagint directly. . . . Of all the classical Roman authors Seneca gives amplest expression to the world of Hellenistic thought which was the product of three centuries of fusion between east and west . . . it is hard to love Seneca the man . . . but it is harder to think of an individual who exemplifies more fully the process with which this book is concerned.' In the chapter on 'An Elect' Hadas discusses the similarity between the Roman and Hebrew notions of membership of an elect communion: 'The doctrine of election as it appears in Augustan Rome is in fact a precise parallel to that in the Old Testament, and we shall see presently that the similarity may not have been entirely accidental.' Finally in 'Authority and Law' Hadas discusses the Jewish conception of authority vested in the post-exilic temple and the Maccabean deviation from this in the direction of Hellenistic practice, derived from Spartan precedent, itself based on the authority of Delphi, and from Platonic doctrine representing the Spartan ideal. He then analyses the positions of Pharisee and Sadducee in the new Hasmonaean kingdom, and concludes: 'If the church learned from its Pharisee opposition and the Pharisees from their Maccabee opposition, as it is altogether probable that they did, and if the Maccabees learned from Sparta, as the character of their polity and the letters of Jonathan would suggest, then we might see the influence of Sparta enormously expanded over centuries of European history. It is neither from ancient Athens nor from ancient Israel but from Sparta that a regime which claims control of every detail of the life of individuals or an autocrat who rules by the grace of God derives.'

Hadas has written a readable book, and it is a great pity that it does not contain more substance and less elaboration of suggestions culled from the periphery of learning. The fruits of his wide reading do not appear to have been subjected to a critical process: he seems to have adopted whatever suggestions, however improbable, have been made for Greek and Hebrew

interaction in literature. The result is a very thin tissue of hypotheses. Add to this the fact that the ultimate roots of Hellenistic (or any other) culture—the history of the individual, in so far as this is recoverable—are ignored, and it will be apparent that we have not been given that work on Hellenistic culture which the title might lead one to anticipate.

All Souls College, Oxford

P. M. FRASER

## ETRUSCAN MAGISTRACIES

ROGER LAMBRECHTS: *Essai sur les magistratures des républiques étrusques*. (Études de Philologie, d'Archéologie et d'Histoire Anciennes, Tome vii.) Pp. 218; 45 plates. Brussels: Institut Historique Belge de Rome, Palais des Académies, 1959. Paper, 200 B. fr.

SINCE the evidence for the Etruscan magistracy, though diverse in nature, is comparatively limited in quantity, it is surprising that no previous attempt has been made to bring it all together within the covers of a single monograph. This valuable task has now been carried out most efficiently by a pupil of Professor F. De Ruyt, Dr. R. Lambrechts, who has divided his work into three parts: the literary, epigraphic, and iconographic sources. He deals relatively briefly with the little that Livy and others have to say about the *principes Etruscorum* and their functions in their own cities and in directing the affairs of the federal assemblies, and with the attributes of power which ancient writers assert were inherited by Roman magistrates from the Etruscans. Next comes a corpus of those Etruscan inscriptions which contain references to any Etruscan magistracy. These are classified on a geographical basis, and after discussion of each inscription a bibliography is appended; Lambrechts has added a new inscription (his no. 34, from Tarquinii) to the forty-two already known. These inscriptions, which are obviously of fundamental importance and difficult to interpret, range from the fourth to the first century B.C. and come from ten centres, chiefly in southern Etruria. Then follows a fully illustrated corpus of forty iconographic items which depict 'les cortèges de magistrates', some of them hitherto unedited and many only summarily described before. They fall into two main groups: sarcophagi and urns, each with two themes, depicting a magistrate either in a chariot (seven of the sarcophagi with this theme carry inscriptions) or else on foot. The composition of the triumphal procession naturally varies in detail (e.g. the order and number of *apparitores*), but consists of lictors (with *fascēs*, but without axe), musicians (*cornicines*, *citharistae*, *tibicines*, *tubicines*), and servants carrying curule chairs, *volumina*, *pugillares* or baggage (*mantica*); a horseman ('*avant-coureur*') or a winged Fury sometimes appears. The theme clearly became conventional, with a religious and funerary significance, so that the man whose remains filled the sarcophagus or urn, need not necessarily himself have been a high magistrate, but since the seven sarcophagi with inscriptions refer to the man as a *zilath*, it can hardly be doubted that these monuments allow us to see Etruscan magistrates in office and that the *zilath* was the chief magistrate. This is of great interest, but the paucity of inscriptions unfortunately renders the detailed interpretation of the sculptural material hazardous. Thus one would like to be able to equate the varying number of lictors with the rank of the magistrate, but Lambrechts is rightly



too cautious to build on such foundations and attributes the number of lictors to artistic considerations (e.g. space). S. Mazzarino made a bold attempt (*Dalla monarchia allo stato repubblicano*, 1945) to utilize the iconographic evidence when he interpreted a terra-cotta from Velletri as an assembly of magistrates instead of gods, and to assess their relative rank, but chronological and other difficulties have prevented general acceptance of this ingenious endeavour (see A. Momigliano, *J.R.S.* 1945, p. 197; J. Heurgon, *Historia*, 1957, p. 66, and Lambrechts, p. 188). Lambrechts's material has a much firmer basis and in his use of it he shows a wise restraint.

The essential problem is, of course, to analyse the titles and functions of the individual magistrates, the vague *principes*. Here progress has recently been made by M. Pallottino and J. Heurgon. Lambrechts's conclusions are on the same lines as, though naturally not identical with, those which Heurgon advanced in his important article in *Historia*. He believes that the *zilath* represented the chief magistracy of the city, that they formed a college in which some at least had special functions (cf. Athenian archon or Roman praetor) and that the president of the college was an eponymous (*zilath purth*). This annual *zilath*, who could be re-elected, administered the city, convoked the senate and submitted matters to a popular assembly, if such existed (attested, probably, at Tarquinii). The secondary college, comprising *maru*, had a magisterial-sacerdotal character and was a prior stage in the official career (iteration is not attested). The League at the sanctuary of Voltumna will have been attended by the *zilath* of each chief city who in their federal roles had the title *zilath rasne* (*principes Etruriae*, and in later Roman times, *praetores Etruriae*); the title of the president of the League is not known (contrast Heurgon, who identifies the president with the *zilath meyl rasnal*). The *cursus honorum* proposed is *maru* attached to a particular cult, *zilath marunux spurana cepen*, and (*zilath purth*), who as such becomes the federal *zilath meyl rasnal*. In short, this is a most valuable contribution to Etruscan studies by a scholar who has examined his material carefully at first hand and whose handling of it inspires confidence.

King's College, London

H. H. SCULLARD

## GREENIDGE AND CLAY REVISED

A. H. J. GREENIDGE and A. M. CLAY: *Sources for Roman History, 133-70 B.C.* Second edition revised by E. W. GRAY. Pp. viii+318. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960. Cloth, 21s. net.

MANY teachers of this period of Roman history have long been hampered by the difficulty of securing copies of this indispensable handbook: thus even a reprint after nearly sixty years would have been most useful, but a new edition is obviously even more welcome. The book has now been recast in more attractive format and type; it has 73 more pages and new indexes; it prints more recent texts and therefore gives better readings (e.g. *Ἀπρίλιος* and *Κάρων* have disappeared from Appian, *B.C.* i. 40, on p. 143). The old appendixes have been replaced by three, which give parts of Livy, *Periochae* lx and lxi, the *S.C. de agro Pergameno* and the pirate law, and a selection of coins. The outstanding value of this new edition is clearly the addition of numerous inscriptions, in which the first was very deficient. They need not be listed here, but the reader



who compares the new Index of Inscriptions with the meagre content of the corresponding Index of the earlier work can see at a glance the enormous difference and can gauge the measure of his debt to Mr. Gray. Besides this epigraphic and numismatic material there are many other useful additions. These include passages relating to such matters as the parentage of the Gracchi (p. 2), αἰπετοῦς ἀνδρᾶς (6), the Attalid legacy (7), a better cistophorus (thus avoiding Greenidge and Clay's error of dating; p. 12), speeches of Laelius (22) and C. Gracchus (29), more of the *lex agraria* (38), Junonia (43), Caepio's imperium (85), Norbanus' trial (118), Scaevola (122), *lex Varia* (138), Sulpicius (161), Italians and citizenship (Licinianus and Appian; p. 175), Sulla Felix (204), Pompey's African command (209) and name (224), Sulla's colonies (217), and Sulla and Cisalpine Gaul (229). This is good measure, but some further addenda could be suggested: e.g. App. i. 14 (ἐν τῷ ἐν τῷ δότει δῆμον); Dio lxxiv. 2 (on the land commission); *I.G.R.P.* iv. 134 (and quote the Barygia inscription which is mentioned only on p. 23); some sentences from Cornelia's letters; *I.L.S.* 5800, for the date of the *lex Antonia*; a bit of the *lex Cornelia de xx quaestoribus*; Cic. *de Fin.* ii. 54 for *quaestio de sicariis*, and quote in full *I.L.S.* 45 which is mentioned on p. 220; and certainly the critical passages about the negotiations between Sertorius and Mithridates ought to have been given in full rather than the passages that are quoted. It might have been worth while to have added a few crucial sentences from Sallust, *B.J.*, enough at any rate to indicate the strategy of Marius' campaigns. In regard to the Marsic War, some passages have rightly been transferred from 90 to 89 B.C., but it would have been helpful to split up the narrative into more sub-headings in order to make the course of operations more intelligible. The Sertorian War also could, with advantage, have been straightened out: Manlius' defeat (p. 231) was probably in 78, not 79; to p. 241 add Plut. *Sert.* 17 about Caraca, and Livy *lib.* xci, about Contrebia; Livy, *Ep.* xci (p. 243) surely belongs to 75 (though not Orosius v. 23), while part of Livy *lib.* xci (quoted under 75 B.C.) belongs to 76; and lastly the passages lumped together at the bottom of p. 247 might have been sorted out, and those relating to the decisive defeat of Hirtuleius at Segovia could have been quoted. Also Fufidius was governor of Further, not Hither, Spain (see p. 228). A few readings may be queried: *quo* for *quos* (Pliny, p. 57), *empturus* for *erepturus* (Livy, p. 206), *voluit* for *voluit* (Cic. p. 221); and surely Greenidge and Clay were wrong in referring *sui* in Caesar, *B.C.* i. 5 (p. 212) to Caesar rather than to the tribunes. Some alternative possibilities in chronology might have been noted: e.g. *quaestio Mamili* 109 (or 110), trial of Decianus 97 (or 98), Pompey's triumph 79 (or 81, or 80). Sulla's arrival in Italy (p. 193) should be 83; Sertorius' death has been left *sub anno* 73, though rightly noted as 72 B.C. (p. 259); the battle near Cabeira has been transferred from 71, but while attributed to 'prob. 72' (p. 253) it has yet been cited under 74. Among the very few misprints noted, on p. 242 read *J.R.S.* for *J.H.S.* A cross-reference on p. 106 to the Tarentine law (Appendix IIc) has unfortunately not been followed up, although space remains for the fragmentary *lex* on p. 281. Points of this nature, however, should not detract from the main issue: Gray has sharpened an old but indispensable tool that had become somewhat blunted by age, and all Roman historians will welcome the return of an old friend in so attractive a form.

*O FORTUNATOS NIMIUM SUA SI BONA NORINT*

A. E. R. BOAK and H. C. YOUTIE: *The Archive of Aurelius Isidorus* (P. Cair. Isidor.). Pp. xx+478; 6 plates. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1960. Cloth, \$17.50.

AT Kom Aushim, ancient Karanis, in Egypt native diggers in 1923 turned up some of the papers of a farmer called Aurelius Isidorus. The majority of the texts were claimed by the Cairo museum; a few went to the University of Michigan, some were acquired by Mr. Merton (P. Merton I. 30, 31, II. 88, 89, 91, 92), others found their way to Columbia University and elsewhere and only a few of these have yet been published (*T.A.P.A.* lxxiii [1937], 357 ff., *J.J.P.* ii [1948], 51 ff.). It is possible that further texts will still emerge. A. E. R. Boak began work on them in 1924, and by 1951 had published 56 in various articles in journals. Between 1951 and 1957 he and H. C. Youtie together published six more. In this volume—the joint work of Boak and Youtie—all the texts in Cairo and Michigan (146 in all) are brought together. Its production is a *tour de force* of scholarship.

Isidorus' life (about 270–324 or later) spanned a critical period in the history of the Roman Empire. The great events passed him by, but echoes from the wider world can be picked up. For instance the duration of the revolt of Domitius Domitianus can now be timed. Especially in the field of administration do novelties occur. Text no. 1, the edict of Aristius Optatus, puts Egypt on the same footing as the rest of the Empire: its *provinciales* are to pay their taxes at a standard rate per aroura and per head. This innovation necessitated a thorough land survey, and the analysis of nos. 2–5 shows that its methods were twice revised. In Karanis and its *horioideiktia* former 'royal' or 'public' land has come into the hands of individuals; the editors argue that the standard rate (three times as high for 'private' as for 'royal' land) was applied ruthlessly, whether the land bore a crop or not. Isidorus as a sizeable farmer, even though he was illiterate, was constantly pressed into service, unpaid and liturgical, as a tax collector. The land on which he paid taxes was declared at 140 arouras in A.D. 308, but had shrunk to 80 in 324, of which only 7 were said to be in cultivation. Was he in fact ruined by being called on to pay the government's tax losses from his own pocket, as he protested that he might be required to do as *sitologus* (68, 16)? It is a good rule not to take *ex parte* statements at their face value. Other *sitologi* must have had to face the same conditions, and Isidorus managed somehow to carry on. But the sombreness of the general picture is confirmed by the continuity of his service, by the great variety of taxes that were to be collected, and the constant worry over arrears; for example, the amount of chaff collected for the tax-year 310/11 was still short of the quota by a half three years later, and a special audit was in progress (10, 13, 16, 17). And the references to persons missing from their homes are too numerous and widespread to be taken lightly.

This is the kind of material historians will find in this book, though it is not served up on a plate. Presumably because they judge it premature, the editors do not even list texts from other collections which belong to this archive (though they know them well) and they offer no general survey of its historical value. But there is a most generous measure of discussion and of ideas in the

commentaries. Youtie and Boak are aware that editors do not finish their task by transcription and translation, but must relate the new to the old. The excellence and reliability of their texts is in general self-evident and leaves little gleaning. In 21. 1, adopting the second approach, why not restore *ἰσμετρηθ-έντος*? 68. 10 perhaps *αὐ[τ]οῦ*, 'on the spot'? 79. 7 perhaps *[ἐκ]ῆ*, and *ibid.* 12 *ἀλ[λ]οτε* *πρ[ὸς τὸ]ν καιρὸν τ[ῆς ἀπο]σπορᾶς*? I cannot, however, understand either the reading or the interpretation of 126. 6-7 *κατὰ | [ἀ]νδρεῖ[ον λ]όγον* *πρὸ σ[ε]ισμοῦ ἐπανεγκίν*: the Greek cannot have the sense given to it, which in any case is unsatisfactory, since there was no opportunity for the extortion against which officials are allegedly warned, while the fiscus is not the right organ to take possession of fugitives; it receives payments only. From a photograph kindly sent me by Professor Youtie it is clear that the verb in l. 7 should be read as *ἐπένεγκίν*. The preceding words may then be construed *κατὰ | ἄνδρ(α)* (the division is Youtie's own) *ἐκ[τ]ῶν λ[όγων] πρὸς τ[ὴν] σ[ε]ισμοῦ*, 'all strangers found in the villages . . . are to pay by way of fine to the sacred treasury at the rate of five folles per head'.

Six half-tone plates give an idea of the hands employed. Two of them (2 and 64) will be useful for dating literary hands. I wish that the amount of reduction employed had been stated, or better still that there had been no reduction, even if only a portion of the original had been reproduced.

University College, London

E. G. TURNER

## MINOAN SEALS

V. E. G. KENNA: *Cretan Seals*. With a Catalogue of the Minoan gems in the Ashmolean Museum. Pp. xiv+164; 24 plates, 172 figs. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960. Cloth, £5. 5s. net.

SEALS are, as Mr. Kenna remarks, practically the best-preserved type of material from Minoan Crete; moreover they are often of remarkable aesthetic charm. It seems strange therefore that until now there has been no full-scale work on them in English; strange too that Evans, who was first drawn to Crete by these very objects, never fully dealt with them in print, and that the Ashmolean collection (mostly presented by Evans himself) has remained till now unpublished. One reason for all this lies perhaps in the difficulties of illustrating the material adequately on paper: not only are the seals usually small in size; a seal needs to be handled if one is to see fully all the detail of the design, which may not reveal itself in a single fixed lighting. Seals are thus unavoidably less accessible to study than, say, pottery; and in addition their style and technique need great sensitivity of appreciation.

This Mr. Kenna undoubtedly has; and indeed, though his name may not appear frequently in references to published work (he being *ad maiora vocatus*), he has long been known as an expert among the specialists. Nor has he limited himself to the Minoan-Mycenaean field, as well appears from his opening chapter on ancient glyptic, which sets the general background by a survey of the origins and use of seals in other ancient civilizations of the Near East. The following three chapters trace the history of Early, Middle, and Late Minoan seals. The author suggests the existence of an original native tradition of *amuletic* use of engraved stones, which was overlaid by the *sphragistic* use

derived from Egypt and the East (though in those regions the seal commonly had some amuletic association as well). About the transition from M.M. to L.M., seals begin to appear which seem to have been amuletic only, bearing stylized motifs of already considerable antiquity which are apparently chosen for some talismanic property. Thus the way becomes open for the development of a separate tradition of engraving of seals designed purely for a sphragistic use. The separation of the two uses is confirmed by the non-appearance of the amuletic types among seal-impressions. (It might be worth considering whether this interesting divergence of traditions is to be associated with any social or administrative change in Crete at this juncture.) The historical chapters are followed by a penetrating examination of technique and a discussion of the influence of Cretan seal styles, with special reference to their relationship with Mycenaean work. The fascinating survival of Minoan influence (and perhaps motifs?) in the Aegean in the archaic period is a theme, only mentioned here, on which one would welcome further study at some time.

The Catalogue, which forms the second half of the book, is as complete as one could desire; description is accompanied by photographs of each seal and of impressions of each engraved face. If the impressions photograph better than the seals, that is perhaps to be expected: the seal is to a great extent a means to an impression. One may possibly question whether a softer lighting, and shadows less black, might not have sometimes given clearer pictures; but in general the illustration of this difficult material is good.

*Emmanuel College, Cambridge*

F. H. STUBBINGS

## GREEK PAINTED POTTERY

R. M. COOK: *Greek Painted Pottery*. Pp. xxiv+391; 56 plates, 44 text figs. London: Methuen, 1960. Cloth, 63s. net.

THIS is an extremely useful handbook which covers the history of Greek painted pottery from the tenth to the third century B.C. It is a pity that Mr. Cook did not start with Mycenaean, particularly as tenth-century Proto-geometric starts in Attica, which has a good and well-mapped history of Mycenaean pottery. Roughly the first two thirds of the book contain the history; the remaining third deals with shapes, technique, inscriptions, chronology, the pottery industry, uses for other studies, practical comments, the history of the study of vase painting, bibliography, etc. Within their limits the sections on individual groups of pottery are excellent and give all that is needed about shapes, decoration, style of drawing, technique, connexions with other groups, chronology, distribution, and, where relevant, excavation.

As this is an historical account, a stricter division by periods would have been more helpful: particularly, orientalizing and black-figure last too long to be lumped together, and this grouping obscures the cross-connexions between late black-figure and early red-figure; similarly the connexions between the late red-figure of Apulia and Gnathia ware and between the polychrome wares of Lipari and Centuripe are obscured because the former are put into the red-figure chapter and the latter into the Hellenistic chapter. However, these difficulties will probably not trouble the student for long; he will learn to jump about.



Another difficulty is the absence of footnotes, which is not wholly solved by the details in the list of plates and the bibliography: I tried, for instance, to find the griffin jug from Aegina (in the British Museum) and the late-fifth-century polychrome oinochoai with comic scenes (in the Agora). The zealous student would in time run the first to earth if he read the works quoted in the bibliography on p. 345, but the only pointer to the latter is '*Hesp.* (casually)' on p. 360. Yet the former is an old friend and the latter one of the more exciting finds of recent years. Where a vase is described in the text but not illustrated the only way to find it is through the bibliography: a footnote reference to a handy illustration would have helped.

The limitations on the usefulness of the otherwise admirable historical part are two, concentration on pottery as pottery and dislike of its later developments. It is not wholly fanciful to draw parallels between vase shapes and contemporary developments in sculpture and architecture, but this is never done. More important, the subjects of the figure scenes are pictures in their own right and they tell us a great deal about contemporary literature and daily life; subjects on the vases illustrated are not mentioned in the list of plates, and they are not always noted in the text; on p. 279 we are told that (1) 'paintings on pots offer valuable illustrations of much of Greek life', and (2) 'zealots look for illustrations of Greek drama. But generally the moderns prefer statistical studies of particular incidents'; but the student is given no hint how to find either kind of illustration if they are not listed in 'special studies of the schools of Greek pottery' (p. 358). Even such a general work as Metzger, *Représentations*, is not quoted.

It is unfashionable to like the fourth century, and the well-worn cliché is that vase-painting had become a minor art. The great Attic painters of the second quarter of the fourth century deserve more space, sympathy, and commendation; early South Italian vases, besides being good, have extremely interesting subjects; Apulian floral ornaments are an entirely new experiment realized with great delicacy, and Apulian polychrome (early Gnathia) brings us nearer to the technique of classical free painting than anything we have.

The second part of the book contains many practical hints useful to the student, including the history of vase-painting, which will explain many forgotten names. This is unique in English and it is wholly justifiable to end it with the publication of Pfuhl's monumental work and the supremacy of Sir John Beazley; this book is itself a distillation of more modern research, and the names of those responsible will be found in the bibliography.

I add some notes on detail. P. 17, why is free-painting in the geometric style 'unthinkable'? P. 19, the prothesis amphora (pl. 4a) is commended but on the oenochoe (pl. 43) 'decoration riots': yet the system is exactly the same, and probably the same painter painted both pots. P. 37, the very interesting geometric in Ischia is underrated and no reference is given. P. 38, 'Now (750 B.C.) a Greek settlement arose at Al Mina'; but we do not know how many earlier levels were swept away to sea (p. 264 is wiser). P. 47, not a Giant but Typhon (Lorimer, *B.S.A.* xxxvii [1937], 178). P. 57, a pity not to mention the scene under the handles of the Eurytos krater. P. 115, how is the inquiring student to find 'the perhaps "Melianizing" piece from Selinus'? P. 159, on the home of Chalcidian see now Boardman, *B.S.A.* lii (1957), p. 12. P. 207, '(Gnathian pots) few have useful contexts.' This disregards Lipari, Gela, and quite a few South Italian sites, to say nothing of Chatby. P. 220, 'The study of Greek

shapes has been laggard', but not so laggard as text and bibliography suggest: such a statement as Beazley's (*A.B.V.*, p. 107) that the potter-work of two vases by Lydos is by Amasis and of a third by Nikosthenes (all unsigned) shows the possibilities (cf. also Bloesch, *J.H.S.* lxxi [1951], p. 29), and many detailed works on shapes are not quoted, e.g. aryballos (Beazley/Haspels), alabastron (Angermeier), kothon (P. N. Ure), krater-names (Rumpf), kyathos (Crosby), kylichnis (Milne), phiale (Luschey), black-figure pelikai (von Bothmer), psykter (Beazley), stamnoi (Johnson). Pp. 258-60, a pity not to quote the other early hexameter inscriptions. P. 264, early dates: Tarsus and Hama deserve a mention. P. 267, the well-dated finds in the Agora and Phryx should be mentioned. P. 357, Amyx' later study in *Hesperia*, xxvii (1958), p. 275 should have been quoted. P. 361, the *Handbook to the Nicholson Museum* is omitted.

The following misprints have been noticed: p. xx (*re* fig. 39): 'stamnos' not 'stammos'; p. 289 'local' not 'vocal'.

University College, London

T. B. L. WEBSTER

## MYTHS AND SOCIETY

HENRY BAMFORD PARKES: *Gods and Men: the Origins of Western Culture*. Pp. xii+489+vii; 16 plates. London: Routledge, 1960. Cloth, 45s. net.

THIS substantial volume surveys the development of Western culture from pre-historic times down through the classical epoch to the establishment of Christianity; very rightly, it includes a sketch of the religious and political history of the Jews. Its keynote is struck on p. 3: 'This book is written in the conviction that the vitality of any society depends on the continued affirmation of mythical symbolisms created by the collective imagination for the ordering of experience, and that a pure rationalism can result only in social disintegration.' It is a rather bold statement, especially as, so far as the reviewer can remember, pure rationalism has never been tried in any human society, and so its alleged disastrous results must be a matter of conjecture; but the fundamental idea underlying it, that every society is kept together by more or less irrational beliefs, more or less articulate and generally accepted, is true enough. The author, then, begins with savagery, his account suffering from a mild overdose of the *Golden Bough*, and continues through peasant-culture, theocratic civilizations, and Near Eastern monarchies, to what he styles the axial period, a term borrowed from Karl Jaspers, which he claims centres around the sixth century B.C., its main products being 'the ethical monotheism of the Jewish prophets and the rationalism of the Greek philosophers', while Zoroastrianism, not at first directly influencing the West, was destined later to do so via Judaeo-Christian doctrines. Now comes the sketch of Judaism (pp. 85-143) from the days of Moses to the post-exilic period, and next two long sections (pp. 147-370) which treat respectively of Greece and of Rome and her adoption of Hellenism. The book concludes with an account of Christianity.

All this is well written, by a man of acute intelligence and historical training, with a very fair knowledge of classical material and, where he has to depend on second-hand information, a critical use of the works he quotes; this by the way has left its mark on the bibliography, which is not a bare list but adds a short criticism of every work enumerated. His work is, however, not faultless.

There are too many pretentious pronouncements like those on pp. 292-3: 'When the world in which men live is felt to be anarchical, the human personality loses its standards of order and tends to become fragmented into its component emotional drives'; and again: 'Much Hellenistic writing was . . . highly formalized, but form had now become simply a conscious technical artifice (as in the well-made plots of New Comedy), a device for providing aesthetic entertainment rather than the expression of a belief in the intrinsic unity of human experience.' Why Comedy of any kind should attempt more than entertainment I confess I cannot see, nor imagine how any sort of drama is to express belief in the 'intrinsic unity of human experience'. Parkes has but a poor opinion of Plato, and his admiration of Aristotle cools when the biological works are quitted. To what extent he really understands these philosophers is another question.

There are also a number of annoying small blunders; the book would have benefited if it could have been read before publication by a good anthropologist, classicist, and, I suspect, Hebraist and ecclesiastical historian. Merely as illustrations, I cite p. 241, n. 4, which states that sexual inversion is unknown to Homer (true) and the tragedians, the latter assertion being contradicted not only by the presumable plot of Aeschylus' *Laïos* but by his fragments 135 and 136 N<sup>2</sup> and Soph. fr. 345 Jebb-Pearson; further, that Aristophanes strongly disapproves of it (where?). Then on pp. 307 ff., Wissowa's mistaken interpretation of the *di indigeles* is assumed, and combined with Peter's view of the *Sondergötter*, while the word 'patrician', which occurs some half-dozen times, is misused with the greatest regularity. A little competent revision would have improved the book. As it is, some mistakes may readily be forgiven a writer who appreciates Alexander the Great as he deserves and thrills at certain lines of Vergil.

All faults allowed for, this is a stimulating work, well worth reading thoughtfully, and one can but wish the author success in his ambitious plan to develop the matter more fully in a series of volumes of which this is meant to be the first.

St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

## ORATIONES OXONIENSIS

T. F. HIGHAM: *Orationes Oxonienses Selectae*. Pp. xi+108. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960. Cloth, 15s. net.

LATINE si quis hodie contionari audet, praesertim si viros artibus scientiisque excellentes extollere vult, non modo vetera exempla sibi proponere sed linguam illam immortalem ad suum ipsius arbitrium accommodare debet. Quis enim virum vel biochemiae vel atomos enucleandi peritum salutare iussus non dico Ciceronianus, sed Erasmius aut Newtonianus iam potest esse? Multiplices vero et peculiare praestare virtutes necesse est oratores nostros academicos. Nempe paucis verbis quid in suo quisque genere perfecit proferendum, viri ipsius quasi viva imago oculis audientium est proponenda. Sed ante omnia poscitur brevis, id quod abhinc tria saecula bene noverat Orator Cantabrigiensis idemque poeta sublimis Georgius Herbertus, qui virum doctum Robertum Creightonem in locum suum suffectum sic de Oratoris officio admonuit:



'brevis sit sermo atque pressus . . . parce doctrinae . . . oratio perfecta, ut vir, *τετράγυμος* est, gravis, nobilis, perspicua, succincta.'<sup>1</sup>

Maxime vero mihi arrident verba de eodem Herberto ab illo usurpata qui vitam eius memoriae mandavit, neminem unquam magis decoram gravemque hilaritatem in opere oratorio navando praestitisse.<sup>2</sup> Nonne praeclare illud 'gravem hilaritatem', nonne huius sermonis generi aptissime? Est nimirum 'artis opus rarae', insolitae, vix cum aliis conferendae; quam tamen caelatorum illorum arti simillimam videri ego dixerim, qui in gemmis anulisque sigilla inculpant, hominum bestiarumque simulacra minuta efficiunt. Sic saltem collega noster Oxoniensis, cuius orationes hic tractamus, virorum et feminarum in omni genere eminentium indoles atque ingenia intra fines exiguos sane, sed mirum quam exquisitè subtiliterque depinxit. Tantam simul varietatem ac novitatem rerum ita tetigit, ita ornavit, ut in his oratiunculis non tam ostendere artem quam (quod summae artis esse omnes novimus) celare videatur. Nam dum aureo eius verborum flumine aures delectantur, dum sale facetiisque animi recreantur, suavitate et venustate mulcentur, vix fingere possumus quanta cura, quanto limae labore sit opus, ut ad hoc absolutionis perfectionisque culmen accedat. Lucernam tamen postulant (experto crede) quae lucernam minime olent.

Sed ut finem faciam, quod praeconium noster fabulatori disertissimo Somerset Maugham tribuit, id optimo iure ad suum ipsius stilum transferre potuit: 'ea omnia est consecutus, ut lucidus sit idemque brevis, ut simplex idemque urbanus, ut levis idemque nervosus.' Nunc rude donatus hoc admirationis amicitiaeque pignus a collega Cantabrigiensi accipiat, multosque in annos valeat floreatque.

Downing College, Cambridge

W. K. C. GUTHRIE

## SHORT REVIEWS

LOUIS MOULINIER: *Quelques hypothèses relatives à la géographie d'Homère dans l'Odyssée*. (Publ. des Annales de la Fac. des Lettres d'Aix-en-Provence, 23.) Pp. 132; 2 maps. Paris: Klincksieck, 1959. Paper, 14 fr.

PROFESSOR MOULINIER writes pleasantly about Odysseus' journeys to and from Troy. His treatment of compass points, winds, and currents (under guidance of *Instructions Nautiques*), and of what may be called the inner circle, is all the better for being soundly conservative, and might usefully have been extended to include the plausible lies and the other *nostoi*. An interesting suggestion on *Od.* ix. 21 ff. is that Odysseus was originally king of Cephallenia-Same with Ithaca,

Leucas-Doullichion, and Zacynthus, and that his story was transferred, with some oversights, to Ithaca. Unlike Leucas, Cephallenia has a strong claim to be the Mycenaean centre of the Ionian Islands. The objection that 'Ithaca' is between Thesprotia and Doullichion in *Od.* xiv. 334 ff. is met by saying that the kidnappers (as they had good reason to do) did not go to their advertised destination. Unfortunately, difficulties remain. It is not easy to take the isolation of 'Ithaca' as political rather than geographical, and Cephallenia is even less *χθοναλή* in either sense than Ithaca. The treatment of the outer circle is bolder and less convincing. Odysseus is sent from Corsica by a North Passage (Rhône-Danube?) to Circe in the Euxine, and thence to an Underworld near Gibraltar. The only conceivable waterway

<sup>1</sup> *The Works of George Herbert*, Clarendon Press, 1941, p. 470.

<sup>2</sup> 'He managed it with as becoming and

grave a gaiety as any had ever before or since his time' (Isaak Walton, *Life of Herbert*).



by which a ship could reach Oceanus in a day's sailing south is the Nile, and nothing suggests that the poet shared Hecataeus' opinion that the Nile flowed from Oceanus (*F. Gr. Hist.* 1 F 302; cf. *Il.* xxi. 193 ff.; Hecataeus does not even appear in the Index). Calypso lives near her father Atlas (Maia did not), and the Phaeacians in Cyrenaica. Corcyra is rejected as Scherie because it must have been known to the Mycenaean. There is no evidence that it was, and the poet did not boggle at putting monsters in places which were; but *Od.* xiii. seems a clear warning against looking for it anywhere. 'If Mr. Churchill had wanted you to know where you are, he wouldn't have taken away all the signposts.' A discussion of Smyrna and Miletus would have been more fruitful, and not inconsistent with the initial hypothesis of a ninth-century poet. This hypothesis is found at the end to be confirmed by the range of Mycenaean trade. If an eighth-century poet had been considered as a possibility, the Mycenaean connexion might have been thought less certain because of the very similar distribution of geometric pottery. Three Mycenaean sherds from Ischia are mentioned three times (add now two from Vivara, William Taylour, *Mycenaean Pottery in Italy*, pp. 8-9), but there is no mention of the eighth-century cemetery from which came the Nestor inscription and the lively shipwreck scene (reproduced together in Myres, *Homer and his Critics*, pl. 8). It is at least possible that the Greeks sent Odysseus monster-hunting in lands which they had themselves recently explored. The book will not end this controversy; its value lies rather in the loving study of the poem which sends a real Odysseus wandering in a real Mediterranean.

St. Hugh's College, Oxford D. H. F. GRAY

FRANCISCO R. ADRADOS: *Líricos Griegos: Elegíacos y Yambógrafos Arcaicos (siglos vii-v a.C.)*. Vol. ii. Pp. 293 (mostly double). Barcelona: Ediciones Alma Mater, 1959. Cloth, 250 ptas.

The authors are Hipponax (pp. 11-68), Ananias (71-73), Xenophanes (77-92), and Theognis (93-257); there follows an appendix (260-74) comprising the smaller fragments which had been deliberately excluded from this volume and its predecessor; finally, concordances and corrections of 'errors

observed' (not nearly all of what actually exist) in the first volume. Each author has introduction and bibliography; below the texts, very brief testimonia and app. crit.; opposite the texts (on pages bearing the same serial numbers as the text-pages), translation with explanatory notes below. Since I said what I did (*C.R.* viii [1958], 223 ff.) about vol. i, it is proper and pleasant to say now that two of its three principal faults are not to be found in its successor. The texts are for the most part highly conventional; the standard of printing and proof-correction has been raised to the expected level. We have still to complain that the reproduction of papyrus-fragments is still far from accurate in an appreciable number of places.

The most useful parts of the edition are the bibliographies, the explanatory notes, and the introduction to Theognis (the editor has worked hard on the manuscripts; his results are by no means wholly in accord with those of Mr. Young, who alone is competent to judge this section). Errors and eccentricities in the texts are not numerous, but the following should be corrected: *Hipponax* 11 ἀνδριάντα τὸν ἄλβιον υ-υ-υ-υ, a monstrous line; 19. 2 ἐφ' ἡσιν, against the metre; 31 ἀφ' ὧν τὸν ἐπιδούλον has no metre at all; neither has 43 μάκαρ ὅτις θηρεῖται πρὸς α-υ-υ; 46 and 57 have no caesura; 62 ἐν ταμίῳ, if there were such a word, metrically impossible; 78. 12, I am baffled by a line ending μῆνα κα[ι] κ[ι] θαρ[ο]ν (suppl. Adrados); 103. 1 and 6 are both unmetrical, so is 104. 40; 104. 49 θαρρηλ- for θαρρηλ-; 115. 12 δδλκον for ἡδλκ-; 117. 3 Ἰωνῶν in the text, as if the all-important last letter were not supplement. *Ananias*: I am not among those who can translate χρυσὸν λέγει Πίθερος ὡς οὐδὲν τῶλλα ('P., speaking of gold, says that everything else is worthless', Adrados). *Xenophanes*: 3. 5 ἀγαλόμεν(αι) is an impossible elision, never to be printed again; 6. 2 print παρὶόντα. *Theognis*: the introduction (62 pp.) is useful and interesting. One will not disagree with the text (which is remarkably free from misprints) more often than with that of, for example, Diehl: only we must ask for changes in 288, where the translation shows that ὡς δὲ τὸ οὔρεσθαι is untranslatable; in 659, οὐδ' ὁμόσαι χρὴ τοῦτό τ' ἐμπορεῖται πρῶτα τοῦδ' ἔσται; 819, ἐπὶ πολυήματων (not a misprint) κακὸν ἤκομεν; 1310, ναῦδ' ἀδδῆ.

Jesus College, Cambridge

D. L. PAGE

D. W. LUCAS: *The Greek Tragic Poets*. Second edition. Pp. xiv+274. London: Cohen & West, 1959. Cloth, 24s. net.

It is not surprising that this eminently useful book has run into a second edition. Mr. Lucas has taken the opportunity to make fairly extensive changes. The chapter on Aeschylus has been rearranged and considerably rewritten, though the light in which the poet is presented remains much the same. The principal changes affect the introductory chapters. By shortening the account of the political and economic background, Lucas has found room to expand the sections on origins, on the theatre, and on the dramatic festivals, and to add a section on the nature of tragedy which is characteristically lucid and sensible. Broadly, the changes are all improvements. I miss a good remark in the earlier edition (93) on the *Agamemnon* as 'lyric tragedy raised to the highest pitch', but welcome in exchange the following comment (106) on the *Promethia*: 'Common sense, which perhaps has no place in this discussion, would suggest that a god who wears one aspect at one time and an opposite one thirteen generations later might reasonably be supposed to have changed in the meantime.'

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM  
*King's College, London*

EURIPIDE. Tome vi. 1 (*Oreste*).  
Texte établi et annoté par  
FERNAND CHAPOUTIER, traduit par  
LOUIS MÉRIDIÉ. (Collection Budé.)  
Pp. 101 (mostly double), Paris: Les  
Belles Lettres; 1959. Paper, 7.50 fr.

FOUR volumes of the Budé Euripides containing thirteen plays had been published by 1925; a fifth volume of two plays appeared in 1950; we now have the first part of vol. vi, containing the *Orestes*. The translation is from the hand of Méridié, who died in 1933; the text and introduction are the work of Chapoutier who died in 1953. Finishing touches have been supplied by M. Dain. It is to be hoped that the completion, so tragically delayed by death, of this useful edition will not be long postponed.

Text and apparatus follow the standard form. One may regret that more use is not made of paragraphs to reveal the structure of the longer speeches, and that the admirably

lucid apparatus does not record at least a few conjectures other than those printed in the text. Alternatives to such readings as ἡναγκασμένους 904 or οὐ 1614 might well be given, and even when the balance is as even as it is between ἀκούσαν and ἐκούσαν 613, or καὶ ἡγήνητορ and καὶ ἡγήνη 294. Alternative ascriptions of lines to speakers are sometimes mentioned, but we are not told that 140-1 are attributed to Electra in the Argument and by Dionysius. The readings of the six most important manuscripts are given as checked by Chapoutier against photographs. The check presumably accounts for the few small changes such as the disappearance of εἶδον 730 as the first reading of B. Ten papyri are cited as against two in the O.C.T., but they add nothing of consequence; ἀπολειφθεῖς ἀκῶν at 216, though itself impossible, may strengthen somewhat the case for punctuating after πρὸς; the omission of the stage direction which has got into the text at 1384 is interesting. As the δὲ of Ox. Pap. 1370, also suggested by Weil, is cited at 1340, it might have been mentioned that Ox. Pap. 1178, which is five centuries older, supports the ἀλλ' of the codd. It is not revealed that δῶθε at 1308 is an emendation of Hermann's.

It is perhaps evidence for the good condition of the text of this play that no name appears in the apparatus more recent than Murray's, whose word order is accepted at 1483. No passage is obelized, though the triple διὰ at 1547-8 with Seidler's ἀλάστορ' is hardly credible, just as is καλεῖν without Porson's τελέσσαι at 1647. Passages where Chapoutier differs from all or most modern editors are 45, retention of ἀπὸ 291 μήπω rather than μήποτε, and 118 where Schmidt's ταρβοῦσ' ἀρε is accepted; at 159 and 186 χαράν is kept where χάριν, which is most unlikely to have been corrupted into χαράν, has been generally read, presumably on the ground that the scholia on 186 imply χάριν. But there is no sign of this reading in Schwartz, and it appears to be rightly dropped from the apparatus. In the text ἐκτίσαν is intruded after ἐκτίσαν 453, perhaps through a misunderstood proof correction, and the punctuation of 591 ὄρε, Ἀπόλλων, should be amended by the omission of the comma after Ἀπόλλων or by the insertion of a colon before.

One of the main problems confronting an editor of this play is that of interpolation. In this text only a moderate number of lines is bracketed and there is fairly close agreement with the O.C.T. Some further doubts are mentioned in the notes, but only a small proportion of all that have been felt. The

retention of 625-6 which repeat rather pointlessly 536-7 is most questionable.

The translation, so far as a stranger may judge, is clear and elegant. Occasionally precision may be sacrificed to simplicity, as at 558 where ἱδίων ὑμετέρων is not quite 'hymen coupable'; Danaus did not assemble the Argives 'pour faire réparation à Aegyptos', 872; δίκας δίδόντα must mean 'when he paid the penalty to A.' or 'when he agreed to accept arbitration', cf. Aesch. *Supp.* 703; 'les décisions . . . je les ai prises,' ἐβούλευσα 1090, places the responsibility too completely on Pylades.

The Introduction gives a balanced account of the play and its circumstances. The search for contemporary references is handled with discretion, as is not always the case in this series. But a connexion between 515 and the new transcription of Draco's laws is possible rather than probable, and stoning to death is too familiar an incident in legend for it to be necessary that the sentence passed on Orestes was suggested by the unhappy end of the younger Alcibiades (Xen. *Hell.* i. 2. 13). The basic discord of the play is well summed up: 'un drame de sentiments et d'idées qui s'achève comme un opéra-comique'. But when so many plays are lost it is inadvisable to derive similar scenes and motifs in extant plays directly from one another. The disturbance of a sick man's sleep is common to the *Orestes* and to the *Philoctetes*, but also to the *Trachiniae*. It is hardly significant for the intended murder of Helen and Hermione that both Clytaemnestra and Aegisthus are murdered at the end of Sophocles' *Electra*, and that in each case *Electra* is represented as commenting on what passes behind the scenes.

There is some confusion about the entrance of the Phrygian. The note on 1366-8 accepts Weil's view that the Phrygian enters in the ordinary way through the door and describes his escape which took place off. In the Introduction the actor's leap is supposed to take place in sight of the audience. Few will believe that Orestes and *Electra* were revealed at the opening of the play by the drawing of a curtain.

King's College, Cambridge

D. W. LUCAS

**DUDLEY FITTS: Aristophanes, *Ladies' Day*. An English Version. Pp. x + 134. London: Faber, 1960. Cloth, 15s. net.**

THE steady improvement which Fitts has maintained through his series of Aristophanes

translations has been a pleasure to trace, and this version of *Thesmophoriazousai* deserves high praise. Without sacrificing any of the vitality, Fitts's verse is now more disciplined; he is sensitive to the changes of style in his original—over and above the obvious parodies of tragedy (an essential item in this play) which, by the way, are rendered on the whole excellently. Only occasionally is a point missed, like the change into iambic tetrameters at 531, or a piece of para-tragedy overlooked, as at 582 ff., though sometimes Fitts makes the tragic lines parodied worse than they really are; e.g. at 900 f. there is nothing in the original corresponding to Fitts's introduction of the rhyme 'bro.' (= brother) and 'so'. This is, in fact, a special example of a more general tendency to introduce jokes not in the original: 'go the whole hog' at 216 is irresistible, but the attempt to make Euripides' 'echoes' at 1069 ff. into comic puns is much more questionable, not only because they are straight repetitions in the original, but because it may be doubted whether such a quick succession of puns would be effective in the theatre. Occasionally, too, he coarsens the original, e.g. by the epithets he inserts at 608.

The lyrics have neatness and vitality, but it is possible to feel that the drastic compression in which Fitts often indulges produces an effect utterly unlike the richness of the original, and that here, as so often, fidelity to the letter would assist fidelity to the spirit.

There is a sprinkling of what seem to be definite mistakes, e.g. 9-10 'You seem to be trying to make sense. Do you mean / I do not need to hear what I do not see?'; 96 'on the revolving porch' (265 'wheeled back' in the translation is correct, though the stage-direction there says 'the inner stage revolves'); 800 'It seems probable, then, that there's something about us you like.' The facts about the *Thesmophoria* (a difficult question, cf. *Σ Thesm.* 80) are misstated in the note on p. 124, and the misuse of 'Choragos' is still there. But the notes will certainly be found useful, and are enlivened by some pleasantly eccentric observations like 'even Euripides' virtuous women have a Cordelia-like inhumanity' (p. 123).

As in Fitts's translation of the *Birds*, the play is subdivided according to the structure of Old Comedy, but in an irregularly constructed play like *Thesm.* there is more room for differences of opinion. In particular, the use of the term 'agorai' in this play at all is questionable, certainly as applied to 687 ff.

But in spite of certain particular criticisms which have to be made, Fitts can certainly



claim to have more than realized Rogers's hope for his own translation, that the reader taking the play as a whole would obtain an idea of what the original was like.

Exeter College, Oxford

D. MERVYN JONES

W. HAMILTON: Plato, *Gorgias*. A new translation. Pp. 149. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1959. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.

This is a good translation in pleasant English, with eleven pages of introduction and occasional footnotes. It is an admirable presentation of the dialogue for the general reader, and a worthy addition to the Penguin Classics series. Minor criticisms: (i) The introduction may give the impression (p. 15) that the *Gorgias* was written soon after 399 B.C., rather than about 387. (ii) The idea that the body is a tomb was not (cf. *Crat.* 400 c) 'characteristic both of the Pythagorean philosophy and of the Orphic mystery religion' (p. 92), though the Orphic soul-prison idea was probably similar. (iii) The author of the Myth of the Water-carriers is described not as a philosopher but as a teller of myths: hence we should probably not (p. 92) take 'Sicilian' as a reference to Empedocles. (iv) The notes on pp. 62-63 scarcely reveal the nature of Socrates' argument at 474-5, for which see Dodds, ad loc., and Adkins, *Merit and Responsibility*, pp. 266-7. (v) There is no inconsistency (p. 147) in the remarks about Aristides, who is praised not as a true statesman, but for his fairness. (vi) Thrasymachus in *Rep.* i is hardly 'Callicles under another name' (p. 14), for Callicles does not, like him (*Rep.* 348 e), admit that what he approves of is really unjust.

But these criticisms may give a false impression; for in general this book is excellent.

University of Manchester

R. S. BLUCK

W. C. HELMBOLD and E. N. O'NEIL: *Plutarch's Quotations*. (Philological Monographs published by the American Philological Association, xix.) Pp. xiii+76. Obtainable through B. H. Blackwell, Oxford: 1959. Cloth, 26s. net.

This list of Plutarch's quotations, references, and possible reminiscences is intended to serve as a basis for further studies, such as

what books this most learned man of his times read? how good were his texts? what accuracy can be expected in his uncontrolled quotations? The authors do not claim to have made an exhaustive collection, and beg specialists in other writers to read Plutarch and communicate to them what additions are to be made. It is to be hoped that the specialists will respond, but they should not expect their gleanings, except in the field of doubtful reminiscence, to add greatly to the harvest here presented.

F. H. SANDBACH

Trinity College, Cambridge

Aelian, *On Animals*. Vol. iii (Books xii-xvii). Translated by A. F. SCHOLFIELD. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. vii+445. London: Heinemann, 1959. Cloth, 18s. net.

Ξουδὴ, φρονίς, and πόσις were qualities to which Aelian aspired as a scholar, and his translator throughout his work has not only displayed the same three qualities, but has exercised the third without allowing it to overshadow the other two. Mr. Scholfield is to be congratulated on maintaining to the end of his translation the freshness and the care which he showed at the outset.

In this, the last of the volumes *On Animals*, I have noted only a few debatable points. xv. 11 Scholfield translates τοὺς Ἠπειρώτας 'those that dwell on the continent of Asia', a sense in which the term is used by Euripides and Isocrates. It seems highly doubtful, however, whether Aelian and his readers in the early third century A.D. could have taken it to mean anything but 'the inhabitants of Epirus'. xvi. 36 Scholfield reads Ἀντιγόνου for Ἀντιόχου, but even if in an earlier passage (xi. 14) Antigonos has been rightly mentioned as the besieger of Megara, it is easier to suppose that Aelian has made a mistake than that all the manuscripts are wrong. In xv. 5 there is a tantalizing corruption οὐ δὲ τῷ ἀκούοντι τῆς τῶν ὄτων τρυφῆς †τῷ ἀκού†, where Post in a footnote tentatively suggests ἀκτινόν and translates 'it is capable of producing delight for the ears of you, etc.' This is hardly satisfactory because ἀκτινόν does not appear to mean 'containing', but 'habitual' or 'consumptive'. Moreover, τῆς τῶν ὄτων τρυφῆς should mean not so much 'delight for the ears' ('you who listen should be pleased to learn', Scholfield) as 'the fastidiousness of your ears'. No less tentatively I would propose παρῳκία, 'a cure for



your squeamish ears', *τυφάει* perhaps suggesting 'disgust', 'aversion', as *fastidium* can. In any case, a *noun* is needed to balance *ἐποὶ μὲν οὐκ ἔστι μέγθος* in the previous clause.

As before, the notes are illuminating and the identifications of animals sound. One wonders while reading xvi. 21 whether the stone-throwing Satyr-like creatures who lived in the wooded glens on the slopes of the Himalayas were ancestors of the Abominable Snowman.

To offset the lack of an index in previous volumes, we are at last provided with no less than four, all of them most useful, one Greek, one English, a catalogue of flora and fauna, and a gazetteer of authors cited.

University of Bristol

D. E. EICHHOLZ

DOMENICO PESCE: *Epicuro e Marco Aurelio*. Due studi sulla saggezza antica. Pp. 85. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1959. Paper, L. 650.

THESE two slight but pleasant essays provide first a general interpretation of Epicureanism, then a discussion of Stoicism as presented by Marcus Aurelius. Epicureanism is discussed under two headings—physics and ethics. The once popular view that Epicurus was only interested in physical doctrines to the extent that they were needed to provide a basis for his ethic is rejected, and Epicureanism is characterized as metaphysical and ontological in its interests and as presenting a consciously devised alternative to Platonism and Aristotelianism. In this the writer is surely correct. Much more doubtful, however, is the contention that the supposed utilitarianism of Epicurean ethics is a mistake. The argument seems to be as follows. The distinction between cinetic and catastematic pleasures is a distinction of quality, not of quantity, and as such is fatal to true hedonism. The elimination of pain which produces catastematic pleasure is not a further good added to life; it is rather something which creates the possibility of living according to life's own rhythm without disturbance from outside. So for Epicurus life, not pleasure, is the end for the wise man. This or something like it has been propounded by others besides Pesce, e.g. De Witt, *Epicurus and his Philosophy*, 1954, p. 218. While it may help us to understand the way in which Epicurus reached his doctrine, it seems sufficiently refuted by the *Letter to Menoeceus* and other texts which are quite explicit.

The discussion of Marcus Aurelius begins

with the contention that Marcus was not an eclectic, but his thought was rigorously faithful to classical Stoicism for which it constitutes the most reliable source. It is true that other sources are either fragmentary, derivative, or hostile, but this does not establish the orthodoxy of Marcus. No attempt is made to demonstrate this by any comparison of doctrines, and it becomes clear that Marcus is simply taken arbitrarily as representing Stoicism in order to provide a convenient basis of comparison with Epicurus. It then becomes easy to say that both Epicureanism and Stoicism set up a non-egoistic asceticism as the preferred pattern of life, a doctrine which is described as both beautiful and true. But neither was able to explain the mystery of death—for both it tends to remain a mere negation of life. Here we touch upon the limitation of ancient thought. The full explanation of death required the message of St. Paul—the victory of Christ over death.

University College, Swansea

G. B. KERFERD

HUBERT KESTERS: *Plaidoyer d'un Socratique contre le Phèdre de Platon: xxvi<sup>e</sup> Discours de Thémistius*. Introduction, texte et traduction. Pp. xvi+296. Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1959. Paper, 290 B. fr.

THIS book is a sequel to the same scholar's *Antisthène, De la Dialectique* (Louvain, 1935), in which he tried to show that the work which has come down to us as the 26th Oration of Themistius is in fact a work of the fourth century B.C. rather than of the fourth century A.D., and that it is to be attributed to Antisthenes. Professor Kesters now returns to the theme with a more sustained effort to prove that the 26th Oration is essentially the work of a Socratic philosopher who was contemporary with Plato and hostile to his version of the philosophy of Socrates, although he is not here concerned to argue further for the authorship of Antisthenes. He believes that the case for his central submission gains in clarity and force if he concentrates his attention on the dialogues of Plato and on the 26th Oration itself, and does not try to attend to the fragments of Antisthenes at the same time. Kesters gives two other reasons for returning to the subject. His earlier book relied on articles which he had published in a journal which was always inaccessible and is now defunct, and he was convinced by the scepticism of his

reviewers that he could not hope to prove his case unless he produced a full and detailed exposition of the 26th Oration and its connexions with numerous Platonic dialogues; and since H. Schenkl had died in 1920 without completing his promised text of the Orations of Themistius, it became necessary to prepare a critical edition of the 26th Oration, of which no new edition had appeared since that of Dindorf in 1832.

This book presents the results of all these researches. Part i, 'Le Débat', which occupies nearly one-half of the total length of the book, is a learned, ingenious, and eloquent plea by Kesters in defence of his principal hypothesis. The evidence is circumstantial and indirect, and while Kesters presents it with great clarity and subtlety, the verdict of a jury must continue to be 'not proven'. He shows conclusively that there are connexions between the 26th Oration and Plato's *Republic*, *Phaedrus*, and *Clitopho*, but he does not discharge the heavy onus of proving that the connexions are evidence of anything more interesting or surprising than plagiarism and pastiche on the part of Themistius. His argument depends heavily on the assumption that Plato, unlike the author of the 26th Oration, was hostile to any attempt to present philosophical doctrine in rhetorical or literary form to large audiences of non-specialists. It is true that Plato preferred the practice of philosophy by individual conversation, and regarded even the purified rhetoric of the *Phaedrus* as a second best. It is also true that the author of the 26th Oration positively prefers mass-media, and that he writes amusingly of the dangers of preaching *l'le-d'le* to powerful and unreceptive politicians, but Kesters weakens his case by exaggerating Plato's hostility to rhetoric and writing. Plato believed that few men were capable of becoming true philosophers, but he set a high value on the propagation of right opinion among a wide audience outside the Academy.

In Part ii Kesters takes his main thesis to have been established, and he goes on to attempt to distinguish the elements in the 26th Oration that were contributed by Themistius himself from the form and content of the supposed classical model. Here again there is the serious difficulty that it is almost impossible in principle to distinguish between a classical work that has been heavily retouched by a Byzantine writer and a Byzantine work that is heavily based on classical sources.

Part iii consists of a text and French translation of the 26th Oration, with a full critical apparatus and an apparatus of *fontes et*

*testimonia*. Part iii is also published separately, and in addition there is a separate publication of the text without the translation.

Even if Professor Kesters had proved his main point it is doubtful whether the 26th Oration would be as important and interesting as he claims it to be, but his book is valuable for a number of helpful discussions of points that will interest Platonic scholars and students of Themistius. Special mention should be made of the section on the *Clitopho*, and of the remarks on the Hippocratic works to which the *Phaedrus* and the 26th Oration are shown to be indebted.

The work is supplied with bibliographies of manuscripts, editions, and critical studies, and with indexes of subjects, names, and authors, as well as a short lexicographical and grammatical index.

RENFORD BAMBOUGH

St. John's College, Cambridge

ITALO LANA: *I proginnasmi di Elio Teone*. Vol. i: *La Storia del Testo*. Pp. 174; 5 plates. Turin: Università di Torino, Facoltà di Lettere, 1959. Paper, L. 2,000.

SOME years ago Lana tentatively proposed the rhetorician Theon as the author of *Περὶ Ὑψους*, but he found it impossible to develop his view in the light of a detailed stylistic examination of Theon's extant *Progymnasmata* because of the lack of an adequate critical edition of them. Lana easily demonstrates the inadequacy of earlier editions, some of which was based on the thorough study of the history and connexions of the manuscripts which he has himself undertaken in the present work. He shows that only three manuscripts merit consideration, Medicean Plut. LV, 10 [L], Modenensis (Estensis) 116 [M], and Parisinus 2915 [P], and that the *editio princeps* (Rome, 1520) [R], on which Walz relied heavily, is a poor reproduction of a copy of M with Renaissance emendations. Rabe, whose notes for an edition of Theon were destroyed by bombing in the late war, discovered a Marcianus (gr. cl. x. 1), but this Lana holds to be a copy of P.

After discussing these manuscripts and the *editio princeps*, Lana gives a critical account of the later editions, showing how little they owe to independent study of the manuscripts. He passes to a detailed consideration of the scholia preserved in the manuscripts, but omitted by R, and hence little known. These scholia are also found in an Oxford manu-

script (Auct. F. 1. 6) without the text, the owner having evidently relied for the text itself on Camerarius's edition of 1541. Lana demonstrates that the scholia, of which he prints a full critical text, are mainly extracts from the commentary on Aphthonius by Johannes Sardinianus, whose date, c. 850, thus provides a date *post quem* for the archetype of the extant manuscripts.

Lana shows that there is also an 'indirect tradition' for Theon in the quotations in later rhetoricians, but although in some respects superior to the manuscript tradition, it appears to have been preserved in two recensions, so that it is not always conclusive for Theon's original text. Finally, Lana argues that the present order of the chapters in the manuscripts of Theon represents a rearrangement in accordance with later rhetorical practice, and he offers a reconstruction of the original order. He promises in a further volume a study of a sixteenth-century Armenian translation of Theon, which is preserved in a seventeenth-century manuscript at Erivan.

Lana may never succeed in demonstrating his thesis about the authorship of *Περὶ Ὑφους*, but Theon is a writer of some merit in himself. Lana's study of his text is, as far as the reviewer can judge, skilful and thorough; it is certainly attractively and persuasively presented. It can be read with interest, too, for the sidelights it throws on the history of scholarship, for instance in the reminders of the *practical* value which the Renaissance saw in the rhetorical writings of antiquity, now so little regarded.

University of Southampton A. E. DOUGLAS

JACOBUS JOHANNES MANTUANUS ZONNEVELD: *Angore metuque*. Woordstudie over de Angst in *De Rerum Natura* van Lucretius. Pp. ix+206. Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1959. Paper, fl. 9.75.

THIS doctoral dissertation, written in Dutch and summarized in two pages of French, is a linguistic study of the notion of anguish and fear in the *De Rerum Natura* of Lucretius. No one can read the poem without being impressed by the frequency and emphasis, and the sense of self-involvement, with which Lucretius insists on the fears and circumstances of fear which beset those not instructed and convinced by the gospel of Epicurus. For the *φόβος* of Epicurus he uses several synonyms or near-synonyms, though

in trying to differentiate between them one should remember his need for scanning equivalents as well as for poetic variety. This study discusses minutely all the passages in Lucretius in which the notion of fear is present, and compares or contrasts them where possible with corresponding texts in Epicurus. It starts with *angor*, and goes on to consider, under *metus*, the other terms, *cura*, *dolor*, *pavor*, *terror*, *horror*, *timor*, *formido*; and also the circumstances and objects with which Lucretius associates anguish and fear. It notices his intensely personal attitude, and his move towards deep pessimism which shows itself at the endings of his books in contrast with the optimism of their beginnings, and especially at the close of the poem in the catastrophic plague at Athens. The author hopes that his primarily linguistic study may contribute in some measure towards an understanding of the personality of the poet.

University College, Oxford

A. F. WELLS

*Studi Ovidiani*. Pp. 145; 6 plates. Rome: Istituto di Studi Romani, 1959. Paper, L. 800.

THE contents of this collection are of more even quality than the *Atti* already noticed (with some acerbity) in C.R. lxxiv. 222 ff., and include much to interest the Ovidian scholar. F. Arnaldi, 'Il mondo poetico di Ovidio': a sympathetic and elegant appreciation, well illustrated by quotations, of Ovid's 'mondo di amori, di suoni, d'immagini, di forme . . .' (p. 24). G. Lugli, 'Commento topografico all' elegia I<sup>a</sup> del III libro dei "Tristia"' (also published at *Atti* ii. 397 ff., a fact which the reader is left to find out for himself): interesting and of course highly expert. Why no map? R. Vulpe, 'Ovidio nella città dell'esilio': a painstaking recapitulation of what is known of Tomi in Ovid's time. Those who criticize Ovid for his lack of fortitude in exile should note that his strictures on the climate of Tomi were far from exaggerated. A. Monteverdi, 'Ovidio nel Medio Evo': a short but well-balanced account, with lively presentation and liberally supported with examples. Something perhaps might have been said about the use of the *Remedia* as a school-text in a cycle which included Cato's *Disticha*, Theodulus, etc., a subject on which there is an interesting literature. N. Lascu, 'La fortuna di Ovidio dal Rinascimento ai tempi nostri': this contrasts unfavourably with the foregoing, being based entirely on the secondary sources, which in



any case are not well chosen; at any rate a rapid survey of the notes to ch. 12 of L. P. Wilkinson's *Ovid Recalled* revealed some notable gaps in Lasca's English material. The most interesting part of his article relates to the literary and dramatic exploitation (there is really no other word for it) which Ovid has undergone in Rumania during the last hundred years. E. Paratore, 'Ovidio nel bimillenario della nascita': this is probably the only item in the book which anybody not a dedicated Ovidian need feel bound to read. Paratore gives a character of Ovid's Alexandrianism which I have not seen equalled. Some of his comparisons and contentions are perhaps overated (and I cannot venture to judge the validity of the analogy which he draws with d'Annunzio), but all in all this is an effective, sincere, and illuminating piece of criticism, well worth pondering.

Peterhouse, Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

ANTONIO LA PENNA: *Scholia in P. Ovidi Nasonis Ibin*. Introduzione, testo, apparato critico. (Biblioteca di Studi Superiori, 35.) Pp. lxiii + 276. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1959. Paper, L. 3,000.

THIS is a worthy successor to the editor's earlier *Ibis*, which it both complements and supplements. La Penna prints a considerably larger selection of the scholia (i.e. from more and later manuscripts) than either Ellis or Lenz, so as to give 'nelle grandi linee, un quadro ampio e ordinato dell' interpretazione del poemetto dalla fine dell' antichità al sec. xv' (p. xxxvi). The editing of such texts as these presents, as he observes, virtually insoluble problems: his intelligent and flexible handling of them compels admiration (see pp. xxxv-xxxviii). The edition contains all (it is not very much) that is really helpful for the elucidation of the poem, and a great deal besides that will be of interest primarily to medievalists and historians of learning. The apparatus criticus is economical but lucid, and there is a brief commentary. Chapter i of the Introduction, on the tradition of the ancient and medieval scholia, is a model of caution; Chapters ii and iii are excellent short sketches of the progress of interpretation in humanistic and modern times. From the Addenda relating to his previous volume many will be interested to learn (pp. 211 ff.) that (all?) the missing *Berolinenses*, long given up for lost, have re-

turned home. Useful indexes to both volumes are appended.

Peterhouse, Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

VINCENZO USSANI: *Nicolai Treveti Expositio Herculis Furantis Senecae*. Pp. xxvii + 183; 3 plates. Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo, 1959. Cloth, L. 3,600.

NICHOLAS TREVETH (or Trevet or Trivet; see *D.N.B.* lvii. 234), an English Dominican who for a time taught at Oxford, in the early years of the fourteenth century wrote a commentary on the tragedies of Seneca. This edition of part of it, which so far as I can judge is an efficient piece of work, will doubtless be welcome to medievalists, but is of little interest to classicists. His *expositio* is rarely more than a paraphrase and, though he occasionally gets right things which are not immediately obvious, contributes nothing to the interpretation of Seneca. There was a time when, in the absence of knowledge about the more respectable manuscripts of the A-family, it possessed some importance for the text; that time is now past. A soft-hearted editor might possibly incorporate in his apparatus the following readings not mentioned by Richter or Moricca (the Budé text is, of course, altogether too unsatisfactory to be considered); 14 his manuscript had a variant (*vel si littera sit*: cf. his remark on 566) *Titanidae*; 49 *petit*; 99 *utetur*; 237 *voluit*; 258 *Thebis*; 450 *fuertunt*; 613 and 970 omitted; 566 *patens*; 734 *hic*; 786 *colubri*. Moricca's reports of Treveth, as we might have expected, turn out to be no more reliable than Stuart showed Richter's to be; I have noted errors at 99, 260, 347 (where he misunderstands Treveth's use of *in*), 971, 987. There is a remarkable agreement with E at 1312 *ferro impresso*. But apparently (this word has to be used because it is impossible to know what lurks behind the symbols A and  $\phi$ ) no true reading is due to Treveth, and when we get a proper critical edition of Seneca his usefulness will without doubt be limited to showing when the readings of C are not traditional; the close relationship between the two is investigated by Mr. Ussani in *Mem. Acc. Lincei*, ser. 8, vol. 8, fasc. 7 (1959), and can be illustrated by, for instance, 96 *vel omiet utinam et C*, where the *utinam* prompted Treveth's remark. Even this humble service will probably be better performed by PS. I should like to remind Senecans on this occasion of an apparently



forgotten fact once mentioned by Rossbach (*B.P.W.*, 1923, 388), that the Cambrai manuscript of the *Nat. Quaest.* (K) contains a thirteenth-century text of the tragedies. Such readings as are known of both suggest that it may be an early copy of C, but in any case it deserves investigation.

King's College, London

E. COURTNEY

A. KURFESS: *Appendix Sallustiana*. Fasc. 1: *Epistulae ad Caesarem*. Editio quinta aucta emendata. Pp. xii + 28. Leipzig: Teubner, 1959. Paper, DM. 2.50.

THE first four Teubner editions of Sallust's *Epistulae* appeared in 1920, 1930, 1950, and 1955 respectively. Ed. 3 was reviewed in *C.R.* lxi. 185. The reviewer has not been able to see ed. 4, and as ed. 5 contains no list of new readings, the variations now noted are from ed. 3. The preface brings the bibliography down to 1958, and records the shadow of doubt which Fraenkel and Dihle have cast on Kurfess's belief that the *Epistulae* are early works of Sallust. A number of misprints have been corrected, e.g. i. 7. 4 *populus*, ii. 13. 8 *paucissimus*, ii. 13. 5 *amplissimus*; but Index II, s.v. 'ei', still contains a reference to a non-existent *nequiret* in the apparatus at i. 7. 1. Two changes in the text have been noticed: in ii. 7. 6 *honorem* of edd. 1 and 2, which was replaced in ed. 3 by *honors* Edmar, is now restored in deference to Paladini; Paladini, too, is responsible for a new reading offered for the crux in i. 5. 6 *ne(c)sis* *conquirat*.

University of Glasgow

D. A. MALCOLM

L. BIELER: *Boethii Philosophiae Consolatio*. (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, xciv.) Pp. xxviii + 124. Turnhout: Brepols, 1957. Paper, 150 B.fr.

BIELER's edition has a limited aim, as is made clear both in his *Praefatio* (p. xii) and in the course of his 'Vorbemerkungen zu einer Neuausgabe der *Consolatio* des Boethius' (*Wien. St. lxx* [1957], 11-21, an essential adjunct to this edition), where it is described as an enlarged version of an *editio minor* planned in 1932, when Bieler was entrusted with the task of seeing through its final stages the edition of Weinberger (*C.S.E.L.* lxxvii, 1934). Accordingly a very brief *Praefatio*,

after three pages surveying Boethius's life and works (with four added *Testimonia*), expounds the basis of the present edition in little more than three pages: three Indexes ('*Loci Sacrae Scripturae*', '*Fontes et Similia*', and '*Initia Carminum*') are given, in contrast to the six of Weinberger's edition. A useful addition is the '*Bibliographia Selecta*' (pp. xvi-xxvi).

Bieler bases his text on the manuscripts included by Weinberger in his '*Conspectus Siglorum*' (*Erfurtensis Amplonianus* 27 there listed is not traceable: cf. Bieler, p. xxvii, n. 2), and also on certain manuscripts utilized by Peiper but neglected by Weinberger (cf. Klingner's recommendation in *Gnomon*, xvi [1940], 26-32). Of the remainder of 84 included in Weinberger's list (pp. xiv-xxi) but used neither by him nor by Peiper, *Turnonensis* 803 (Weinberger, no. 75) is used throughout by Bieler, *Harleianus* 3095 and *Laurentianus* LXXXVIII. 19 (Weinberger, nos. 35 and 26) being less frequently employed: one manuscript known neither to Weinberger nor to Peiper, *Neapolitanus* IV. G. 68 (cf. E. T. Silk, *T. A. Ph. A.* lxx [1939], 352-5), is under constant reference. No description of the manuscripts and no account of their characteristics is given. Bieler follows Weinberger in using the evidence of Planudes' Greek version, at times, e.g. iv. 3. 36 *extremo*, iv. 4. 99 *caeco*, giving it excessive weight in view of possible corruption in that version or in the translator's copy.

No attempt is made to establish the relationship of the manuscripts used (a small fraction of the total number extant): Bieler writes (p. xii) '*non tam codicum quam ipsarum rationem habendam esse lectionum*'. It is unfortunate that Bieler has not explored the evidence for the tradition which may be offered by the variant readings in Greek passages—this suggestion Bieler makes at p. xiv, n. 26.

Commendable in general is the reduction in the extent of the apparatus by omission of readings which allow of no reasonable doubt (cf. *Praefatio*, p. xii). Omission of references to readings adopted by earlier editors and rejected by Bieler is less praiseworthy since this may occasionally give a false picture: e.g. at ii. 1. 2 Büchner's preference for *evanescentis* is mentioned, but not Peiper's, and at iii. 2. 26 Peiper's approval of *appetunt* goes unnoticed. Failure to refer to the adoption by previous editors of readings accepted by Bieler (e.g. iii. 3. 5 *deserit*, iv. 3. 7 *idem*, iv. 3. 50 *lupi*) is a serious flaw.

Bieler's textual proposals fall into two categories, those embodied in the text and those tentatively suggested in the apparatus.

The former category includes ii. 1. 36 *nec praesens*; ii. 1. 8 *subitis*; iii. 10. 76 *sed* (<deus> *natura*); iv. 2. 81 *idem* *selesti* obelized; iv. 4. 114-15 *apparet*, *inquam* add.; v. 4. 2 *distribuit* obelized. The latter includes i. 3. 3 *clauduntur sidera*; i. 5. 5 *tam* (for *quam*); ii. 6. 10 — *quos* (*extra quos* at 'Vorbemerkungen', p. 18); iii. 3. 45 *etsi*; iii. 10. 7 *nam* (for *non*); iv. 4. 3 *quod e* *orum*; iv. 4. 60 *mali*, (<*mali*> *ipsa*); iv. 5. 7 *mim* (<*uel*>); iv. 6. 132-3 (<*iniucundo sinis interdum*> *remorderi*); iv. 6. 185 *rationum*; v. 3. 90 *potest* (<*esse*>); v. 4. 96 *tamen* *imaginabilem*; v. 6. 67-68 *minime* attributed to *Philosophia*.

Space prevents discussion of individual textual problems here, so that argument in support of the alternative readings or conjectures given after Bieler's readings in the following list must be omitted: i. 4. 33 *iniurium* (*iniuriam*); i. 4. 45 *exacerbasse* (*exaceruasse*); i. 5. 41 *gaudet* (*gaudent*); ii. 4. 16 *pudicitia pudore* (*pudicitiae pudore*); ii. 6. 10 (<*extra*> *quos* (<*extremos*>); iii. 2. 26 *petunt* (*appetunt*); iii. 6. 15 *proxima* (*pro maxima*); iii. 8. 10 *degas* (*deligas*); iii. 10. 91 *bonum* (*bona*); iv. 2. 8 *captus* (*catus*?); iv. 3. 50 *lupi* (*lupis*); iv. 6. 22 *rebus gerendis* (*rebus regendis*); iv. 6. 102 *adiuvantur* (*adiuvantur*); iv. 7. 7 *foederat* (*foderat*). Suspect also are the readings adopted at iii. 1. 4 *quam tu*; iii. 2. 26 *dulci*; iv. 3. 47 *merito*; and iv. 5. 10 *nex*, while Bieler's proposal at iv. 6. 132-3 (cf. *supra*) is open to weighty objections.

Bieler follows Weinberger in adding page by page references to source-material: *loci non ad verbum expressi*, distinguished by an asterisk in the pertinent indexes, preponderate, and many of these attributions must be viewed with suspicion since some expressions involved are clearly common-places, while others are dictated by their context. Bieler himself, at 'Vorbemerkungen', p. 12, speaks of 'vage Anklänge' and 'literarische Topoi' in this connexion.

A recurrent defect of presentation is the duplication of information about lacunae in manuscripts (e.g. pp. 27, 32, 35, 41, 42-43). Misprints are few.

University of Manchester D. R. BRADLEY

VICTOR EHRENBURG: *Der Staat der Griechen*. Teil 1: Der hellenische Staat. Teil 2: Der hellenistische Staat. Pp. viii+122; viii+102. Teubner, 1957 and 1958. Cloth, DM. 9 and 7.90.

THE reviewer must apologize for the delay in the notice of this work; he alone is responsible

for it. Dr. Ehrenberg's book, published in two parts, represents a second edition of his work *Der griechische und der hellenistische Staat* in Gercke-Norden, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* (ed. 3), vol. iii. 3 of 1932, and this new edition is now available in an English translation ('with additions and corrections') entitled *The Greek State* (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1960). What was formerly part of a 'handbook' has been converted into an independent work without losing anything of its former purpose. The original work, as well as being modernized, has undergone considerable expansion, with some modification of the subdivisions; both volumes are supplied with an index lacking in the first edition. The high praise accorded to the first edition (*C.R.* xlvii [1932], 273) is more than merited by the second. Few writers could compress so much not only on political institutions but also on the background development of the Greeks into so limited a space. This is especially true of the section on the Hellenistic Age, which, in the English translation, should prove of wide interest to non-specialists. Equally valuable are the up-to-date bibliography and notes; what might have been a dreary compilation is in fact strikingly readable.

Through the nature of the subject many highly controversial problems are involved, but they have been dealt with clearly and without bias. Sometimes the degree of compression involved and the necessity of generalizing have introduced obscurities for those without a certain amount of background knowledge, in cases where it is not clear whether an observation is made relative to Athens, to some other state, or to the Greek states as a whole. In fact a little more expansion, and something more in the way of definitions of terms, would have been a good thing.

University of Sheffield

R. J. HOFFER

T. R. S. BROUGHTON: *Supplement to 'The Magistrates of the Roman Republic'*. Pp. vi+92. New York: American Philological Association (to be ordered through Blackwell, Oxford), 1960. Paper, \$2.00.

THE experience of the last eight years has amply confirmed the unanimous reception of *M.R.R.* as an indispensable book of reference for all work on the Republic (cf. *C.R.* iii [1953], 111-13; iv [1954], 282-3). A reprint of vol. ii has made it happily possible for

the author to add a supplement of 89 pages, which can also be acquired separately. Its bulk is taken up with a list of individuals about whom there is something new to say, thanks to new evidence or recent discussion; this list also contains 155 new names which did not figure in the main work. In his introduction Broughton pays generous tribute to help he has had, especially from Sir Ronald Syme, Dr. Badian, Dr. Cadoux, and Professor Lily Ross Taylor, the last two of whom have sent long and extensive criticisms, the results of which are apparent in these pages. The prosopographical list, which forms the bulk of the book, follows the alphabetical order of the 'Index of Careers' in vol. ii, a convenient form of reference, since it is an easy matter for scholars who use *M.R.R.* frequently to mark those names in the 'Index of Careers' for which the Supplement now affords new information. There are also two pages of further errata, seven pages of new bibliography (since 1952), and a concordance of those names in the 'Index of Careers' for which a *R.E.* article has become available since 1951 (Pompeii—Pupius, Valerius—Villius).

To run through the Supplement is to gain a quick orientation on material recently made available and issues recently prominent in controversy. Here are a few examples: the identification of the law in the *Tabula Bantina*, the question whether the new *elogium* from Brundisium concerns Q. Fabius Cunctator or a local magistrate, the proconsular imperium of Spanish governors, the newly found milestones from near Vibo Valentia and from Zaccharone in Sicily, the date of M. Caelius' quaestorship, and the chronology of Caesar's career. The need for the Supplement reflects the vigour with which Republican studies are just now being conducted: its publication postpones by a decade the time when a new edition of *M.R.R.* will become essential.

University of Liverpool

F. W. WALBANK

*Atti del Terzo Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina*, 1957. Pp. lvi+469; 51 plates. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1959. Paper, L. 9,000.

*Festschriften* and the *acta* of conferences are notoriously the graveyard of learned articles: these *atti* of the third epigraphic congress constitute a veritable necropolis. Forty-six contributions of varying length, totalling 434 pages, are preceded by 56 pages of record of the actual sessions in which even the

questions from the back row of the hall have been immortalized; and all this, with indexes and illustrations added, for the substantial price quoted above. The Italian organizers, who arranged and carried through the congress with such success, have produced in fact a very comprehensive and thorough volume, which does them credit; but will each fresh congress seek to outdo its predecessor in the scale and detail of its published records?

Collections of material of this kind are usually too miscellaneous for convenient use and too uncritical in the quality of the material published; the volume under review is no exception. Some of the contributions are straightforward and useful records of work on hand, like Mihailov's statement of the progress to date of the Bulgarian *Corpus*: some are interesting and valuable studies of a particular historical problem, e.g. Vogt on Pergamum and Aristonicus, or Rendić-Miočević on Greek colonization in Dalmatia: others are publications of inscriptions of greater or lesser interest and importance, of which some at least could well have been reserved for local or international periodicals. W. Peek alone preferred to hold his contribution for publication elsewhere. The result has been to create an almost indigestible volume which it has taken this reviewer a twelvemonth to work his way through, nibbling at it bit by bit wherever he felt sufficiently courageous: he admires those who were able to complete the task sooner (e.g. Joyce Reynolds in *J.R.S.* xlix [1959], 208-9).

In a brief notice such as this it would be impossible, and it is in any case invidious, to single out individual articles for special mention, despite the merit and acumen of some of them; equally it would be tedious to repeat a table of contents. The chief importance of international conferences lies less in the papers formally read than in the informal contacts outside the lecture-room, the friendships made or renewed, the interests shared, and the theories discussed among small groups. Let the first *actum* of the Vienna congress therefore be that it will cut formalities to a minimum and that it will publish no *acta* whatsoever.

Corpus Christi College,  
Cambridge

A. G. WOODHEAD

*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. Volumen xvi. Pp. xvi+270. Leyden: Sijthoff, 1959. Paper.

*S.E.G.* continues to maintain a high standard



of punctuality and printing, on which editor and publisher may alike be congratulated. The contents of this volume are very varied, Athens claiming the lion's share (1-234), while other major sections are those of Sicily and Italy (535-622), Caria (632-708), and Cyrenaica (865-931: see below). This is not the place to repeat former criticisms, but attention should be drawn to two or three tendencies which have become increasingly evident in recent issues, are very marked in this volume, and seem wasteful of space and of readers' time. These are: (1) the publication of series of texts in improved versions which have not been previously published in the normal manner with a commentary, and thus lose much of their value (e.g. Cyrenaica, 876-930), (2) the publication as separate items of a large number of insignificant bibliographical references (e.g. 47, 108-9, 142, 189, 234, 272-3, 275, 290, 367, etc.), and (3) the tabular analysis, in the manner of a table of contents, of the inscriptions contained in corpora, etc. (e.g. 369, the contents of *I.G.*, ix. 1. 2.; 422, the contents of *I. Bulg.* i; 709, the contents of *Didyma*, ii; 752, 757, 759, the contents of *M.A.M.A.*, vii; etc.)—I find it very hard to envisage what class of reader would consult these curious concordances.

*S.E.G.* seems to be in danger of becoming an assorted collection of material relating not only to epigraphy but also to Greek History in general. The volumes could be much curtailed and improved if these bibliographical and pinacographical growths were cut out, and if, at the same time (as has been suggested on previous occasions), the texts of definitive epigraphical publications containing valuable commentaries were not reproduced (less the commentaries), and attention were concentrated on the collection of scattered publications of inscriptions. From such a work a brief and perhaps serviceable volume would result.

All Souls College, Oxford

P. M. FRASER

GIACOMO CAPUTO: *Il teatro di Sabratha e l'architettura teatrale africana*. (Monografie di Archaeologia Libica, vi.) Pp. 90; 93 plates. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1959. Paper, L. 10,000.

THE theatre of Sabratha seems to have been built towards the end of the second century A.D. With its diameter of 92.60 m., a stage-building 42.70 m. high, and seats for 5,000 people, it was the largest of the African theatres. The excavation of the theatre was

begun in 1927 by Renato Bartoccini; during the next four years Giacomo Guidi conducted the grandiose task of reconstruction, and after his death Caputo succeeded him. The air photograph (fig. 53) shows the restored building (1937); a comparison with figs. 19 and 20 gives some notion of the task accomplished by the Italian archaeologists and engineers. To Domenico Vincifori we owe the fine drawings showing the theatre in its pristine splendour.

Caputo gives us a detailed account of each part—cavea, conistra, hypocaustum, pulpitum, stage-building, and portico; he does all that can be done by text, splendid photographs, and reconstructions to explain these technical matters. He is interested in every aspect of the theatre, and we pass from the scientific world of archaeology to the twilight region of conjecture on stage usage. Special attention is given to what is perhaps the most remarkable feature of the theatre, the reliefs on the low wall in front of the pulpitum. Some of these are commemorative, e.g. the figures of Rome and Sabratha (?), and Septimius Severus offering the libamina (?). But there is also the striking 'academy scene' showing teacher and pupil; while the 'Judgement of Paris', with its eight figures, is claimed as a stage scene, showing us something of the resources of a third-century theatre. There is always a danger of becoming too fanciful in inference; for example, do the vertical slots in the wall behind the stage-doors (p. 27) prove the use of sliding frames containing scenery? Even if all three doorways had displayed such scenery, it would still have been broken by the spaces between the doorways, to say nothing of the awkwardness of having to slide the scenery out of sight every time someone went in or out. From the great height of the back-wall one may indeed argue for the appearance of 'flying' figures (for which there is other evidence); but it seems risky to cite here (note 71) the 'modern revaluation of the scenic action in the tragedies of Seneca', especially as Caputo himself (p. 64) holds that pantomime and mime held almost absolute sway on the stage by the time this theatre was built.

The very difficult problems and dilemmas involved in reconstruction are well set out in the words of the engineer, Giuseppe Marino (pp. 39-41). Another difficulty (the demand of Governor Balbo in 1936 for a reconstruction of the cavea to an unwarrantable extent) was stubbornly overcome.

From Sabratha Caputo passes to a general account of theatres in Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, and Tripolitania. We cannot doubt



that this is a work of fundamental importance, and we look forward to the appearance of Caputo's promised book (no. iii in this series) on the theatre of Leptis Magna.

University of Bristol

W. BEARE

T. BURTON-BROWN: *Early Mediterranean Migrations. An Essay in Archaeological Interpretation*. Pp. x + 84; 17 text-figs., 2 plates. Manchester University Press, 1960. Cloth, 18s. net.

In the distribution of the early second-millennium pottery found at Kahun in Egypt the British Museum received the bulk of the fragments of Kamarene-type ware, and these have been studied and explained on the hypothesis of import from Crete. But the Kahun pottery included other wares whose affinities are obscure; an especially important collection of such fragments is to be found in the Manchester Museum; and, studying these wares in the light of his exceptional knowledge of Near Eastern pottery, Burton-Brown has come to the opinion that the variety of new types at the beginning of the Middle Kingdom reflects a general change in the character of Egyptian culture. This essay therefore begins with a publication of selected fragments in Manchester and proceeds to an appraisal of the universal significance of these new types.

Burton-Brown finds that the polychrome of Kahun is not limited to Cretan types; and, arguing that it is unlikely that people converged from different regions to introduce different versions of a single ceramic principle, he assumes that the Kahun polychrome is not Cretan but stems independently from a common source, which he seeks in the Caucasus region (it is not clear whether the new material from Phaestus will affect this belief). In itself, the author's reasoning is cogent; but he tends to under-estimate human inventiveness (e.g. he claims that Kahun vase-types 'recur' in Greek Geometric, but without considering whether the Greek vase-forms may not have been evolved spontaneously from types which show no such affinity; and it seems almost naïve to remark of the pinching of jug rims for convenience in pouring that 'the idea of this detail is to be considered . . . introduced to Egypt from elsewhere, . . . introduced to that land on occasions at intervals').

In the later chapters Burton-Brown develops his theory of wide-spread and fre-

quent migration from the Caucasus region, pausing to name and castigate some scholars who use phrases like 'influence' and 'borrowing'. The essay is at times distressingly sententious; and the lack of any mention of parallel studies (like those of Herzfeld and Hencken, or Schefold's *Bergvölker* and Schachermeyer's *Kulturtriften*) gives an impression of waywardness. Migration is Burton-Brown's panacea. He denies the diffusion of ideas through trade. He cites the button-amulets of Egypt as 'illustrating the movements of a particular group of Asiatics', but he gives no hint what we should then infer from the distribution of segmented faience beads. He claims that the similarity of Etruscan art with that of Greece in historical times springs from a common source and not borrowing; but he ignores the elementary evidence of stylistic study and the Greek epichoric scripts. As regards early Greece, his theory of migration from the Caucasus region has its interest, and objects like the 'Urartian' cauldrons at Gordion and Greek sanctuaries or the eighth-century gabled 'prostyle' temple on the relief from Musasir could well have been mentioned here. But what then does Al Mina represent? And why do our earliest literary sources maintain so provoking a silence? The survey ends with La Tène and Saxon art; and this review must end on a note of doubt whether archaeological evidence alone is capable of bearing so vast a superstructure as the author wishes to erect upon it.

University of Bristol

J. M. COOK

FRANÇOIS VILLARD: *La céramique grecque de Marseille*. (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome: fascicule 195.) Pp. 177; 58 plates. Paris: de Boccard, 1960. Paper, 45 fr.

STUDENTS of Greek economic history should read and reflect on this intelligent and valuable treatise. Villard begins by cataloguing the Archaic and Classical Greek pottery found at one place or another in Marseilles. His classification and dating of the finer ware is accurate and reliable; and though his claim that the common banded pottery is Ionian seems to me very doubtful and I am not happy about his Aeolian bucchero, these differences do not affect his main argument.

Villard's conclusions, which also use comparative evidence from other western sites,

coins, and literary statements and silences, are briefly these. (1) In the second half of the seventh century Rhodians traded around the delta of the Rhône. (2) About 600 B.C. Phocaeans founded Marseilles. (3) During the sixth century Marseilles prospered and (4) traded up and beyond the valleys of the Rhône and Saône. (5) In the fifth and most of the fourth century Marseilles was impoverished and (6) had no regular trade with the interior, but instead (7) the Etruscans were trading across the Alps to the Rhine valley. (8) These changes were caused not by general conditions in the western Mediterranean but by the new political circumstances inland that accompanied the replacement of the Hallstatt by the La Tène culture. (9) Shortly before 300 B.C. Marseilles again became active in Gaul. (10) The object of Massiliot trade with Gaul was in both its early and late periods tin from Britain. Villard has collected his evidence honestly and thoroughly, and presented his argument honestly and carefully. The reader must judge for himself of the validity of his methods and conclusions. I give my own opinions. (1) is dubious, since the archaeological evidence is quantitatively insufficient and not certainly identifiable as Rhodian. (2), (3), and (9) are sound, and (4) and (7) are probable. (5) and (6) may well be right, but further evidence is wanted. (8) is more hypothetical; incidentally the number of Greek pots from Spain and Languedoc is too small to be reliable statistically. (10), which is the remotest part of the argument, is still more hypothetical, though by no means impossible. In summary, this study sets a new standard for the historical interpretation of archaeological evidence.

The plates are adequate. In the index to the plates the page references are perhaps to the manuscript; they are not to the text printed here.

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,  
Cambridge*

*Études d'Archéologie Classique*, ii. (Annales de l'Est, publ. par la Fac. des Lettres de l'Univ. de Nancy, Mémoire No. 22.) Pp. 147; 39 plates. Paris: de Boccard, 1959. Stiff paper.

This volume contains nine historical and archaeological studies dedicated to the memory of Marcel Launey.

In 'Observations on Greek Siege-craft'

A. Aymard discusses the reasons for the virtual non-existence in Greece before the second half of the fourth century B.C. of a scientific system either of defending or of assaulting cities, in contrast to the Orient, where Assyrian reliefs, for instance, reveal highly organized and ingenious methods of siege-craft. The causes of this were, he thinks, largely financial, economic, and social, so far as defence was concerned; while the classical Greek contempt for mechanical devices that had no more than a purely practical purpose retarded the development of engines of attack. In a second paper Aymard sketches the role in Greek history of the mercenary, defined as the professional soldier working for pay in the service of a state not his own. Mercenaries were known in Greece from the eighth to the sixth century B.C., during that protracted period of evolutionary disturbance through which the city-states all passed; disappeared during the term of relative equilibrium within the individual states that marked the fifth century; reappeared on a scale unprecedented as a result of the social and economic crises provoked by the Peloponnesian War and extended through the fourth century; and finally endured to the end of the Hellenistic epoch, despite the fact that Alexander's conquests had opened up to the Greek populations new sources of wealth and made new lands available for emigration.

F. Chamoux convincingly identifies as 'Hermes Parammon' the youthful, beardless, male head with ram's horns which is a favourite type on fourth- and third-century B.C. coins of Cyrene and is often shown as wearing a fillet with an 'apex' of leaves above the brow. This head-dress, worn by athletes on fifth-century Greek vases, is affected by Hermes as protector of the gymnasium, while gems and bronzes show the god horned, as befits the Arcadian deity whose adjunct is a ram. The argument is reinforced by a passage in Pausanias describing the association at Olympia of Parammon (= Hermes) with Zeus Ammon; and we know that at Rhodes, with which Cyrene had close connexions, there was a similar association. But epigraphic evidence for the cult of Hermes Parammon at Cyrene itself is not as yet forthcoming.

J. le Gall's first article traces from literary sources the role played in Roman history by the Servian Wall from 361 B.C. to the end of the first century A.D. The author argues for an early-fourth-century dating of the wall of solid tufa blocks and for an earlier, possibly regal-period, certainly pre-Gallic-invasion, dating of the lighter cappellaccio

construction. The *pomoerium*, so he demonstrates, was a building-free belt of territory just within the Servian Wall (*postmoerium*) and primarily not religious but military in purpose. Of its alleged extensions in imperial times only those of Claudius and Vespasian are assured and attested by the inscribed *cippi* of those emperors that have come to light. In a second paper the same writer discusses the ancient evidence, literary and archaeological, for the meaning of the word *fals* in ancient Roman times. As the implement employed for pruning vines and other plants and for cutting corn it was a short-handled knife with curved blade, the equivalent of the French *faucille* and the English 'sickle'. Only the *fals fenaria* used for cutting hay may have been a long-handled *fals* or 'scythe'; and the scythe in the Middle Ages was used for cutting hay alone. On pl. 7, fig. 2, not fig. 3, portrays one of the short sides of the Junius Bassus sarcophagus.

G. C. Picard contributes an important paper on the floor-mosaics of the Trajanic Baths in a sumptuous Roman private house at Acholla in Tunisia. All can be dated to the early second century, apart from the pavement of a hot room in the north-east angle of the building, which represents a fourth-century restoration. Of the non-figured pavements some show a simple style reflecting Italian first-century influences, others a 'flower-style' characteristic of such Hadrianic pieces as those found at Tibur and Ostia. The figured pavements reveal three sources of influence—that of late-Hellenistic survivals at Alexandria of classical pebble-mosaics; that of Hellenistic pavements proper; and that of the fourth Pompeian style of mural painting: in the case of pieces of the third type the Achollitan mosaic craftsmen not only produced designs that reflected those of painted and stuccoed ceilings, but also made the unsuccessful and short-lived experiment of 'projecting' on to floors motifs that were intended essentially for walls. Picard suggests that the Hellenistic polychrome pictorial mosaic style, which in Italy gave way to purely geometric patterns during the first century A.D. and to black-on-white figured compositions during the second, but which was revived in the provinces in the early second century, had been kept alive during the first century of our era at Alexandria. As regards the Triumph-of-Bacchus scene in the *frigidarium* of the Baths, Picard believes it to be a political allegory of Trajan's Parthian victories. But could it not be, alternatively, an 'other-worldly' allegory of the soul's triumph over death and evil?

In an article on the origins and early history of the wall-mosaic H. Stern demonstrates that literary texts and monumental evidence converge to date the invention of this craft in the late first century B.C. or first century A.D. and to locate that invention in Italy. The earliest wall-mosaics, worked in cubes of glass and marble, which are often combined with shells, are those adorning fountain-niches. The prototypes of such niches were Hellenistic artificial grottoes sacred to the Nymphs and Muses. But the idea of decorating structures of this type with mosaic was conceived on Italian soil, despite the fact that the earliest wall-mosaicist whose name we know, Tiberius' freedman the *musarius* Nicephorus, was of Greek extraction. The association of wall-mosaics with water remained close far on into the second century A.D. Only in the third century did wall- and vault-mosaics lose this special characteristic. The author gives a very full and useful list of all examples of the art known to him throughout the Roman Empire.

In the first of his two contributions E. Will returns to the problem of 'Parthian Art'. He is surely right in contending that the rigid, illogical frontality that marks groups of supposedly interrelated figures in reliefs and paintings of the first three centuries A.D., found at such centres as Dura-Europos, Hatra, and Palmyra, was not the conscious expression of any politico-cultural antipathy of East versus West. Earlier oriental art had consistently employed the profile viewpoint; and it may be, as he holds, that the idea of the frontal view-point was inspired initially by Hellenistic Greece. Nevertheless, uncompromising frontality as the Duran, Palmyrene, etc. artists practised it was so wholly unclassical that it amounts to an original Iranian creation; and it is noteworthy that there is no trace of this style in official west-Roman sculpture until the end of the second century A.D., when the period of close imperial contacts with the Parthian region was inaugurated. It should also be observed that in the historical relief from Taq-i-Bostan (pl. 34, fig. 2), which Will cites as an example of Sassanid return to the earlier oriental profile viewpoint, the subsidiary figures show faces turned sideways but trunks and legs that are pulled round ruthlessly into a frontal pose.

Will's second paper distinguishes three types of *adyton* in Romano-Syrian temples, all alike differentiated from the 'concealed' Greek *adyton* in being open rooms in which the cult-images could be exposed, but to which the priests alone had access. The types



are: (1) the Palmyrene type: 'chamber-adyton': Temple of Bel—of Assyrian origin; (2) the Lebanese type: 'oedacula-adyton': Baalbek temples—a more Hellenistic conception of west-Syrian origin; (3) the Hauran type: 'apse-adyton'—a development and variant of (1).

J. M. G. TOYNBEE

Newnham College, Cambridge

*Opuscula Atheniensia* iii. (Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae, 4°, VII.) Pp. 214; 30 plates, 46 figs. Lund: Gleerup, 1960. Paper, kr. 85.

THE seventh volume of this intermittent series contains eight papers—six in English one in Latin, and one in German.

P. M. Fraser (pp. 1–54) examines, with more notes than text, the popularity of Sarapis in the Hellenistic period. He concludes that Sarapis was selected by Ptolemy I as a city deity for the Greeks of Alexandria, but achieved only some local support. Though private and public cults of this god were established among Greeks elsewhere, it was especially outside the Ptolemaic dependencies; the founders were presumably mercenaries and merchants who had returned from Egyptian service or trading, or else politicians hoping for Egyptian friendship. This is an interesting and pertinent paper, though through enjoyment of paradox Fraser tends to force his argument.

E. Roos (pp. 55–97), in another amply annotated paper, maintains that in the *Plutus* Aristophanes was not hostile to Asclepius: he makes his point with laboured erudition. J. Crampa (pp. 99–104) issues a prospectus of the 130 inscriptions found at Labraunda to titillate specialists in Hecatomnid and Hellenistic Caria. E. Gjerstad (pp. 105–22) supplements his study of Cypriot pottery (*S.C.E.* iv. 2) with an austere typology of shapes, for which students of the subject should be grateful: it is, though, a pity that the drawings have no scale, and that nomenclature should differ between Greece and Cyprus. P. Åström (pp. 123–33) describes with dedicated care the contents of a tomb of the Middle Bronze Age at Galinoporni in Cyprus. V. Karageorghis (pp. 135–53) has worked through the pottery in Stockholm from Enkomi (*S.C.E.* i), and by making new joins and disinterring other sherds adds usefully to Mycenaean studies. J. Schäfer (pp. 153–75) describes a curious building at Old Paphos:

for its inner planning he finds Persian parallels and, since the date allows it, he suggests that this was the residence of the Persian governor. Finally T. B. Mitford (pp. 177–213) publishes at length twenty new syllabic inscriptions from Marium and Paphos: some of his comments concern philologists and historians, though he is not convincing on Naucratis (pp. 179–81).

The volume is carefully produced and well illustrated, and the English of the Swedish contributors does them credit.

R. M. COOK

Museum of Classical Archaeology,  
Cambridge

ALAN ROWE: *Cyrenaican Expeditions of the University of Manchester, 1955–7*. Pp. xiv + 34; 14 figs., 46 plates (4 in colour). Manchester: University Press, 1960. Cloth, 42s. net.

ANCIENT Cyrene is well provided with cemeteries. Rowe has already given some account of his first campaign there (*Cyrenaican Expedition of the University of Manchester 1952*). Now he reports on three later campaigns and adds a list of small finds from that of 1952. After some general remarks on his tombs, their dating, funerary rites, and Persephone, Rowe proceeds to describe the burial-places one by one and to tabulate their contents; rather inconveniently he lists apart objects found in 1955–7 and illustrated here, objects found in 1955–7 and not illustrated, and objects found in 1952 and also not illustrated. The few coins are catalogued separately by J. F. Healy.

Rowe is concise in his descriptions, and if illustrations are adequate such conciseness is admirable. For the tombs he gives clean and intelligible, though crowded, plans and sections and some helpful photographs: this chapter achieves its purpose. But for the objects many of the illustrations are disgraceful and, since the descriptions too are uninformative, anyone who wishes to study the contexts of the tombs must go to Cyrene (or, for the objects listed on p. 33, to Manchester): creditably the text gives the inventory numbers. Rowe himself evidently knows little about Greek archaeology—witness his reliance on Daremberg-Saglio and the remark that the coins found in N. 83-BH should help to date the red-figure pelike found with them (p. 12, n. 1). So it is not surprising that though there are several other characteristic specimens of Attic red-figure (and one of South Italian—pl. 37 d–e),



he is very chary of giving dates to his contexts. But at least this report suggests that Rowe has found material for a fairly exact chronology of a part of the cemeteries at Cyrene.

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,  
Cambridge*

D. H. COX: *Coins from the Excavations at Curium, 1932-1953*. (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 145.) Pp. xii+125; 10 plates. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1959. Paper, \$5.00.

THE excavations at Curium have yielded a large number of site-finds, amounting to over 750 separate varieties, nearly all in bronze, which illustrate local circulation over nearly two millennia, though the representation of different periods is somewhat uneven. From the period before Alexander certain bronze issues, which cannot be accurately attributed on internal grounds, were found in sufficient concentrations to suggest that they may have been minted at Curium itself (nos. 3, 4, 5, and 8). After Alexander for two and a half centuries the coinage of the island was Ptolemaic, and a list such as this gives valuable help in separating the Cypriot from the Egyptian issues.

The excavations produced remarkably little coinage of the first two centuries A.D., whether from the provincial issues of Cyprus itself or from the imperial series. With the third century, however, there is a marked increase, and it is suggested that part of the large issues of Elagabalus and Severus Alexander, usually attributed to Syrian mints, may have been produced in Cyprus (nos. 144-6). A further increase follows in the fourth century with the mint of Antioch providing nearly twice as much coinage as either of the two next commonest, Alexandria and Cyzicus; Rome, Constantinople, and Nicomedia occur quite often, but the remaining mints in only isolated specimens. In the sixth century, though the numbers of coins are much smaller, it is Constantinople which provides three times as many coins as any other single mint, and nearly as many as all the other mints together. The series ends with a few coins of the medieval kings of Cyprus and several imported pieces of the later Middle Ages.

In a series of site-finds such as this few outstanding single pieces are to be expected;

notable here are the three bronze medallions of the late second century, of which one was hitherto unpublished (no. 230). Full notes and discussion accompany the list of coins and over a hundred examples are illustrated.

*Ashmolean Museum, Oxford*

C. M. KRAAY

C. KERÉNYI: *Asklepios: Archetypal Image of the Physician's Existence*. Pp. xxvii+151; 58 figs. London: Thames & Hudson, 1960. Cloth, 30s. net.

THIS sumptuously printed and admirably illustrated book is a translation, adequately made by an American and printed in the United States, of the author's treatise *Der göttliche Arzt* (Basel, 1947; revised ed., Darmstadt, 1956). The nationality of translator and printer accounts for what may seem surprising in a book from London publishers, the occurrence of Americanisms in the spelling and vocabulary. The work gives an account of the principal seats of Asklepios' cult, beginning, rather oddly, with that at Rome and continuing in the order Epidaurus, Kos, and Trikke, with an intervening chapter discussing 'hero-physicians and the physician of the gods in Homer'. A short appendix described as a postscript explains the labyrinthine foundations of the tholos at Epidaurus as a place for the sacred snakes, and a preface sets forth some of the principles which guide the author in his interpretation of the facts. All the factual parts are well illustrated with figures of Asklepios himself and of a few others associated with medical mythology, such as Chiron, and with good views of the archaeological sites. A student unacquainted with the larger works on the subject, which have of course been used with suitable acknowledgement, might quickly pick up a good and accurate outline of the subject. But when the material is commented on, the result only too often is not only a fanciful explanation but such fancy as, in the reviewer's opinion at least, would never have occurred to any Greek of the classical or pre-classical period. Kerényi, here as in several other works by him, seems obsessed by the long obsolete theory of some fifth-century sophist, that Apollo is a sun-god, and persistently drags in mentions of 'the limits between chthonic darkness and solar radiance', which are somehow 'effaced' in the cult on Tiber Island (p. 17), 'the divine child's light-epiphany' (p. 29, referring to the birth of Asklepios), and the like. If the subject were

the syncretistic cult of Apollo-Helios, which certainly did exist in Hellenistic times, such expressions might find more or less justification, but not when so old a figure as Asklepios is dealt with. As a pendant to his solar Apollo, moon-goddesses make all too frequent an appearance, sometimes in most curious places; thus the folk-tale, known from Kallimachos and other authors, of how the crow used to be white until Apollo in wrath turned it black, 'is a mythological expression of the darkening of the moon' (p. 93). Needless to say, Koronis, or Aigle, is one of these lunar figures, as on p. 96, where her lover Ichys, 'who in his original relation to the moon woman was only the male principle, proves also to be Apollo's darker double'. With all allowance for the imperfections of ancient evidence and legitimate theorizing on the part of an erudite modern, I can find no slightest probability in such exegesis as this.

On the other hand, there are dicta with which any reasonable person must agree, and one of them comes early, on p. xiv. Kerényi there protests strongly against the *argumentum ex silentio* to which some researchers are rather prone, not least when dealing with the evidence of Homer. 'How can one draw distinctions on the strength of what is not said and assert that what Homer passes over in silence is a hero-cult? How can one infer that the cult of a chthonian god Asklepios was not yet in existence because the *Iliad* does not speak of it?' The most indeed one can say is that the cult, if there was one, of Asklepios was not conspicuous in Homer's day, at least in upper-class religion; men remembered him as ἀμύμονος ἰατρίπος, 'a leech full fine', and that is consistent with well-nigh any theory that anyone can put forward concerning him.

St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

BRONISLAW BILIŃSKI: *L'antico oplite corridore di Maratona: leggenda o realtà?* (Accademia Polacca di Scienze e Lettere, Conferenze, fasc. 8.) Pp. 32. Rome: Signorelli, n.d. Paper.

THIS is an interesting lecture by a well-informed student of Greek athletics. The tale of the messenger from Marathon, whatever his name was (when Philippides is mentioned, why does Biliński insist on calling him Pheidippides, in face of the clear evidence of Aristophanes that that name is a comic invention?), can be traced back to the fourth century B.C., and Biliński even

finds an allusion to it in Aristophanes, *Knights* 1333. This may well be set against the silence of Herodotus and the late date of our surviving direct authorities, Plutarch and Lucian. Allowing for popular and rhetorical embroideries, the author is willing to believe the tale to be substantially true, i.e. a runner was sent to bring word of the Persian defeat to Athens, in advance of the return of the armed forces to guard the city. The reviewer is inclined to agree.

St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

RUBY GINNER: *Gateway to the Dance*. Pp. xii+210; 12 plates. London: Newman Neame, 1960. Cloth, 30s. net.

MISS GINNER, it appears, devotes herself to reviving Greek choral dancing, a task impossible of fulfilment in any literal sense, for our evidence, mostly from ancient art, shows us only particular poses of dancers, not the movements which led up to and followed them. However, it is plain that she has evolved some graceful ballets which embody many of these poses, thus giving a sort of conjectural restoration of the nearly lost originals. She gives several descriptions of these dances, and adds an account of Greek history, religion, and mythology containing some rather odd chronology, curious ideas of the nature of various deities, and interpretations of sundry legends which can hardly pass muster. The numerous pieces of translated Greek which adorn the pages include an extract from Anacreon which belongs to the Anacreontea and a fragment allegedly of Sappho which I cannot find at all. Clearly, she is much more at home when training her dancers or dancing herself. ἔρπον τις ἢ ἰκαετος εἰδεῖν τέχνην.

St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

HOMMAGES à Léon Herrmann. (Collection Latomus, xlv.) Pp. xi+804; 52 plates, 18 figs. Brussels: Latomus, 1960. Paper, 1,200 B. fr.

L. Alfonsi, Sul 'Circolo' di Lutazio Catulo; M. Amand, Vases inscrits rhénans à Tournai; J. André, Cinq notules sur l'*Ibis* d'Ovide (344, 404, 470, 502, 508); A. André, Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Roman Monuments; R. Andreotti, L'imperatore Licinio nella tradizione storiografica latina; J. Aymard, L'animal et les vertus 'romaines';

J. Babelon, Numismatique de Britannicus; L. Bakelants, *Le De Universitate* de Nicolas Biesius; H. Bardon, A propos des *Histoires*—Tacite et la tentation de la rhétorique; H. Bieulet, L'exploration archéologique de Bavai; B. Biliński, *Dulores* de Pacuvius et les guerres serviles en Sicile; G. Bonfante, Les rapports linguistiques entre la Grèce et l'Italie; L. Botoucharova, Sur la question de la muraille de l'acropole de Philippopolis; A. Boutemy, Une copie nouvelle du *Status Imperii Iudaici*; E. Bréguet, *In una parca duobus*—thème et clichés; A. Brouwers, Casa Romuli ou maison de Kyrinos? (Damascius, *vit. Isid.* 88); G. Bruzin, Epigraphe votiva bilingue di Aquileia; G. Cambier, L'épisode des taureaux dans *La Légende de Mahomet*; A. Cattin, Sénèque et l'astronomie; P. Courcelle, *Escae malorum* (Plato, *Tim.* 69 d); A. Degrassi, Coronide, madre d'Esculapio, nel culto di Roma repubblicana; M. Delcourt, Tércence, *Heaut.* 77, 168–72, 498–508; C. Delvoye, Sur la date de la fondation des SS. Serge et Bacchus de Constantinople et de S. Vital de Ravenne; E. Demougeot, L'empereur Honorius et la politique antijuive; W. Deonna, *Manus oculatus*; J. Doignon, L' 'impiété' de la Lyonnaise Suttia Anthia (*C.I.L.* xiii. 2279); G. Dumézil, *Quaestiunculae* indo-italicae; E. Dutoit, Le vocabulaire de la vie politique chez Tite-Live; P. J. Enk, *Novae observationes* de codd. Propertianis Daventriensi i. 82 et Ottoboniano-Vaticano 1514; C. Favez, Le roi et le tyran chez Sénèque; S. Ferri, *Vei patria victa*; R. Filhol, *Usurpatio Trinocitii* (Gell. x. 15); G. Florescu, Deux tablettes nouvelles des cavaliers danubiens; A. García y Bellido, L. Terentius figlinarius de la legio III Macedonica; A. Gerlo, Philologie classique et néo-latinité; L. Gerschel, Comment comptaient les anciens Romains?; P. Gilbert, Caractères et origines du rinceau architectural romain; J. F. Gilliam, *Notae militares* in Isidori *Etym.* i. 24; A. Grenier, *Carmina epigraphica*; M. Hélin, *Ut ita dicam* et *similia*—recherches sur le sens linguistique de quelques écrivains du moyen âge; N. Herescu, Autour de la *Salax taberna* (Cat. 37); J. Hubaux, Du Songe de Scipion à la Vision d'Énée; R. Huygens, Les passages des lettres de Jacques de Vitry relatifs à S. François d'Assise; C. Hyart, La concordance des temps du subjonctif dans le style indirect de César; E. Janasens, Sénèque et la prise d'Oechalie; J. Klemenc, Die Familie Prisciani und ihre Verwandten auf den Grabdenkmälern von St. Peter in Savinjeka dolina; J. Le Gall, Les modifications du niveau de la mer depuis l'époque romaine en

Méditerranée Occidentale; M. Leglay, La vie intellectuelle d'une cité africaine des confins de l'Aurès; R. Lucot, Sur un type latin d'hexamètre; R. Marache, Le jugement d'Aulu-Gelle sur Salluste; D. Marin, Abba, Pater; F. Masai, Nouveaux fragments du Paul Orose de Stavelot en écriture onciale; P. Merlat, Pline le Jeune, propriétaire foncier; P. Mertens, *La damnatio memoriae* de Géta dans les papyrus; J. Michel, Le prologue de la *Casina* et les mariages d'esclaves; A. Neppi Modona, Ricerche su alcuni termini relativi ai ludi circensi; M. Paladini, Elezione dei magistrati al tempo di Plinio il Giovane e di Traiano; E. Paratore, *Hercules Ostentus* 725, 1199; J. Perret, Un équivalent latin de la loi de Porson; C. Picard, Les origines plastiques du Laocoon et les triades bachiques aux serpents dans l'art gréco-romain; M. T. Picard, La frise du Forum de Nerva et l'iconographie latine des Parques; A. Piganiol, Le mystère de la Maison des Griffons; V. Pisani, *Casus interrogandi*; J. Préaux, *Deus Christianorum Onocetes*; M. Renard, Ulysse et Polyphème—à propos d'une mosaïque de Piazza Armerina; G. M. A. Richter, Some Italic and Roman Engraved Gems in Cambridge; A. Salvatore, Note sul testo delle *Diras*; R. Schilling, Un passage lacunaire du calendrier préjulien d'Antium éclairé par Ovide, *Fast.* i. 289–94; J. Schwarz, *Quelques Quaestiones homericae et virgilianae* chez les écrivains latins; G. Stégen, Sénèque, *Ep.* ii. 14. 16; F. Thomas, Plaute, *Men.* 141 ff.; R. Thouvenot, Sur deux statuettes de gladiateurs du Maroc romain; V. Tourneur, A propos des effigies d'Horace; A. Tovar, Deux notes sur Propertius (ii. 9, ii. 22. 48–51); D. Tsontcher, Contribution à l'étude de la sculpture romaine dans la province de Thrace; D. Tudor, Une nouvelle tablette des cavaliers danubiens; B. L. Ullman, *Epipredia* (Juv. 8. 66); R. van Campenolle, La date de la fondation de Rome chez Velleius; P. van de Woestijne, En marge d'Avienus; C. van Essen, *C.I.L.* vi. v. 3055/56<sup>o</sup>; J. van Ooteghem, Une scène de sacrifice dans le sixième chant de l'Énéide; R. Verdière, Le baiser d'adieu de Néron; W. Vollgraft, Le rôle des lions dans la communauté mithriaque; J. H. Wassink, *Propertianum* (iv. i. 37–56).

*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.* Vol. lxiii. Pp. 528. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1959. Cloth, 60s. net.

DEDICATED to Werner Jaeger in honour of



his seventieth birthday: a bibliography of his publications is prefixed. W. Schadewaldt, *Der Prolog der Odyssee*; H. Langerbeck, *Margites*—Versuch einer Beschreibung und Rekonstruktion; G. M. A. Hanfmann, *Lydiaka*; E. Wolff, *Die Entscheidung des Eteokles in der Sieben gegen Theben*; H. Patzer, *Die dramatische Handlung der Sieben gegen Theben*; J. H. Finley, *Pindar and the Persian Invasion*; E. A. Havelock, *Parmenides and Odysseus*; L. Woodbury, *Parmenides on Names*; A. Turyn, *On the Sophoclean Scholia in the Manuscript Paris 2712*; F. Müller, *Die blonde Bestie und Thukydides*; Z. Stewart, *Democritus and the Cynics*; C. O. Brink, *Plato on the Natural Character of Goodness*; W. C. Greene, *The Paradoxes of the Republic*; R. Walzer, *On the Arabic Versions of Books A, a and A of Aristotle's Metaphysics*; H. A. Wolfson, *The Plurality of Immovable Movers in Aristotle and Averroes*; J. Whatmough, *Degrees of Knowing*; F. Solmsen, *Aristotle and Presocratic Cosmogony*; G. A. Kennedy, *Aristotle on the Period*; G. Zuntz, *Zum Kleantes-Hymnus*; J. Kroymann, *Die Stellung des Königtums im i. Buch von Ciceros Staat*; V. Pöschl, *Die Einheit der ersten Römerode*; M. Hammond, *Plato and Ovid's Exile*; H. Fuchs, *Der Friede als Gefahr—zum zweiten Einsiedler Hirtengedichte*; E. G. Berry, *The De Liberis Educandis of Pseudo-Plutarch*; H. Bloch, *Sette Bassi Revisited*; A. D. Nock, *A Cult Ordinance in Verse*; S. Dow, *Οι περί τὸ διανοεῖσθαι*; J. F. Callaghan, *Basil of Caesarea—A New Source for St. Augustine's Theory of Time*; G. Luck, *Palladas—Christian or Pagan?*; P. Levine, *Two Early Latin Versions of St. Gregory of Nyssa's περί κατασκευῆς ἀνθρώπων*; P. J. Alexander, *Church Councils and Patristic Authority—the Iconoclastic Councils of Hiercia (754) and St. Sophia (815)*.

*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. Vol. lxiv. Pp. 262. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1960. Cloth, 48s. net.

J. B. WARD-PERKINS, *The Problem of Etruscan Origins—Some Thoughts on Historical Method*; R. Syme, *Livy and Augustus*; W. G. Runciman, *Plato's Parmenides*; C. P. Segal, *Ἔφος and the Problem of Cultural Decline in the De Sublimitate*; Mary R. Lefkowitz, *Pyrrhus' Negotiations with the Romans, 280–278 B.C.*; Z. Stewart, *The Song of Silenus*; R. MacMullen, *Roman Imperial Building in the Provinces*; Anne Bromberg,

*A Phlyax Vase in the McDaniel Collection*; D. G. Mitten, *Ancient Lamps in the McDaniel Collection*.

*Acta Classica: Proceedings of the Classical Association of South Africa*. Vol. ii, 1959. Pp. 138. Cape Town: Balkema, 1960. Cloth.

P. J. CONRADIE, *The Antigone of Sophocles and Anouilh—a Comparison*; B. A. van Groningen, *Een psychologische Beschouwing der Atheense Democratie*; B. L. Hijmans, *Posidonius' Ethics*; J. P. Louw, *On Greek Prohibitions*; G. van N. Viljoen, *Plato and Aristotle on the Exposure of Infants at Athens*; L. Baumbach, *Petroniana*; T. F. Carney, *The Promagistracy at Rome, 121–81 B.C.*; K. D. White, *Technology and Industry in the Roman Empire*; A. M. Hugo, *De Corrigendis Adolescentiae Studiis (Melanchthon)*; C. P. T. Naudé, *The Glaze Technique of the Greek Vase*. Bibliotheca Classica Africana, 1950–59.

The volume is dedicated to Alexander Petric, Professor of Classics in Natal from 1910 to 1946, a memoir of whom is contributed by S. J. H. Steven.

ALEXANDER LENARD: *Winnie Ille Pu*. A Latin version of A. A. Milne's *Winnie-the-Pooh*. Pp. 121; illus. London: Methuen, 1960. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

THERE is no harm in trying to turn *Winnie-the-Pooh* into Latin for fun, though probably only a Ronald Knox could hope to make the attempt seem worth while or make a reader share the translator's satisfaction. But it is hard to see any reason for turning it (or anything else) into a language which has a masculine *pratulus*, a feminine *canticula*, and a perfect *annuscit*, and which displays such idioms as *dimidium duodecenis*, *multas felices reditones dici*, *latissimum cackinnum extollit*, or *sese frenos imponere*. The object can hardly be to make the work of those who teach Latin to the young even harder than it is, but that may well be the result. If one had heard *hic colligimus Nuces et Maïum* quoted as a schoolboy howler, one would have taken it with a grain of salt: it is here in print. Fun is fun; this is just as funny as writing *beaucoup d'heureux retours du jour* and calling it French.

University of Glasgow

C. J. FORDYCE



# SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

## MNEMOSYNE

### 4TH SERIES XIII (1960), FASC. 3

M. van Straaten and G. J. de Vries, *Notes on the VIIIth and IXth Books of Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*: on the reading and interpretation of seventy passages. O. Skutsch, *Emendationes comicae Latinae*: (1) Plaut. *Amph.* 729, for *tibi* read *bili*; (2) *Bacch.* 1173, for *quod ferias* read *tu quod* (or *quod tu*) *ferias*; (3) *Merc.* 358, for *iam* read *is me*; (4) *Rud.* 425, read *non licet sic placide bellum bellum belle tangere*? (6) *Ter. H.T.* 652, for *si* read *ni*. Audrey N. M. Rich, *Plotinus and the Theory of Artistic Imitation*: P., continuing to use Platonic terminology out of loyalty to his master, revolutionized the meaning of *μίμησις*: he may have recognized three levels of artistic achievement, idealistic (Phidias), mimetic in a derogatory sense, and an intermediate type (cf. Roman portraits of the third century A.D.) emphasizing the inward meaning as opposed to the outward form. H. W. Pleket, *The Hot Springs at Icaria*: in reply to Croon (*Mnem.* 1956), c. 1938. Polites excavated what is almost certainly the temple of Artemis Tauropolos at Na, in the North-west of I.; Asclepios could have been patron of the hot springs at Therma. N. B. Booth, *Oedipus' Supposed 'Clus'* at *O.T.* 221: *σύμβολον* has here either the technical sense 'residence permit' or a generalized meaning 'token of relationship'. G. J. D. Alders, *Ἥλιος Γάιος*: Caligula is called by John Malalas, *Chron.* 10, p. 243, 3-4, *Ἥλιος Γάιος*, just as in *S.I.G.*<sup>3</sup>, 798. 3 he is called *νέος Ἥλιος*. J. B. Bauer, *Negat nesciss* (Varro *Men.* 45): this unnecessary use of two negative verbs can be paralleled in canons of the synod of Elvira (c. 300).

## REVUE DE PHILOGOLOGIE

### XXXIV. 2 (1960)

P. Chantraine, *Grec nominatif pluriel οὐδένους*: this new noun from the Acarnanian inscription *I.G.* ix. 1<sup>a</sup>. 434 is best explained as a compound of *όν* and the root *\*ed-*, 'eat'. R. Bloch, *L'origine du culte des Dioscures à Rome*: an archaic Latin inscription from Lanuvium, which presents the D. in forms and with an epithet clearly derived from Greek—*Castorei Podlouquique* (perhaps a miswriting for *Poldouceique*) *quirois* (i.e. *κούροισ*)—points to their having come into Latium direct from Magna Graecia by about 500 a.c. H. le Bonniec, *Notes critiques sur les Fastes d'Ovide*: defends i. 74 *lingua*, 85 *spectet*, 245 *vulgus*, 321 *rogans*, 351 *sucis*, 451 *in calidis*, 461 *nupta*, 497 *firmata*, 547 *actos*, 599 *sumet*, 688, *uda seges*, ii. 18 *vacas*, 23 *cordis*, 288 *erit*, 367 *vectibus*, 647 *alta*, iii. 451 *causas gravis*, 499 *me iuvat et laedit*, 726 *visitator*, 739 *florida*, 815 *ornate*, iv. 399 *nota*, 866 *culta*, v. 46 *timenda*, 131 *coverat*... *Curius*, 162 *a canis*, 682 *praeterita*, 684 *vana*, 691 *pascenti*. N. van Brock, *Notes myceniennes*: (1) none of the words beginning with *terap-* can be certainly connected with *θεράπων*; (2) the supposed patronymics in *-ijo-* express dependence on an overlord; (3) adjectives in *-(i)jo-* from proper names express subordination or dependence; (4) *wanaso* is *\*Favak-jo*, 'serving the *ávaξ*'. J. Taillardet, *Grec εὔρειν* is perhaps a reduplicated aorist from *\*steer-*, a doublet of *\*wer-*. F. Bader, *Apophonia et recomposition dans les composés*: examines the factors which modify the normal operation of apophony in Latin compounds.

# CORRESPONDENCE

## Archilochus, Fr. 2

HAVING read with interest Professor J. A. Davison's discussion of this couplet in the *Classical Review* of March 1960 I would with acknowledgements to him propose a somewhat different explanation.

Ἐν δορί μὲν μοι μάλα μεμαγμένη, ἐν δορί  
δ' οἶνος  
Ἰσμερικὸς πίνω δ' ἐν δορί κεκλημένος.

That the couplet is something of a riddle or *jeu d'esprit*, probably complete in itself, is suggested both by the dramatic repetitions

of *év δοπλ* and by the slightly less than sober alliterations of the δ's, the μ's, the ν's, and the initial vowels of the three *év's* and *οίvos* 'Ιαμαρεός. It will have been in that good wine, no doubt, that (as I shall suggest) a general economic truth assumed a clear though temporary importance in the poet's mind.

The key to the solution of the riddle (as it has certainly been to us) ought surely to be found in the concluding word *κεκλμμένος* in close association, as it is, with the verb *πίνω*. In that case *év δοπλ*, lying between those two words, must naturally mean the wooden couch on which the drinker reclined. And if *év δοπλ* in all three parts of the couplet is to be 'capable of bearing the same meaning', as seems inevitable, that meaning must be 'tree'; and the thought will be as follows: 'A wonderful thing is wood, when you come to think of it—for all of us, richer or poorer.' In a tree was my barley-bread

kneaded; on a tree Iamarc wine is grown; and here on a tree I recline and drink it. (<χαίρε καὶ πίνε εὖ.>)

It is a more usual figure no doubt to use the part for the whole than the whole for the part. But I see no grave difficulty in ascribing these modest flights of fancy to a writer of drinking songs. *Arbor* in the Latin poets, as indicated in Lewis and Short, can mean almost anything made of wood: and after all a kneading-trough is made of 'tree', and so is a chair or couch. It would be nice if the Greeks had used wooden casks for their wine. Then all three *év δοπλ's* would refer to manufactured articles. As it is, the second one will have to mean the tree on which was trained the vine that grew the grapes that yielded the juice that, duly fermented, inspired Fr. 2, wooden only *ultima ex origine*.

L. G. POODCK

Christchurch, New Zealand

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.*

- Albini (U.)** Andocide: L'orazione De Reditu. Introduzione e commento. Pp. 110. Florence: Le Monnier, 1961. Paper, L. 1,200.
- Amenós (J. B.)** Heródoto: Historias. Libro i. Texto revisado y traducido. (Colección Hispánica.) Pp. 154 (mostly double). Barcelona: Ediciones Alma Mater, 1960. Cloth.
- André (J.)** Pline l'Ancien: Histoire Naturelle livre xv. Texte établi, traduit et commenté. (Collection Budé.) Pp. 135 (text double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1961. Paper, 7.50 fr.
- Arrighetti (G.)** Epicuro: Opere. Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e note. Pp. xxvi+669. Turin: Einaudi, 1961. Cloth, L. 6,000.
- Autenrieth (G.)** An Homeric Dictionary. Pp. xxi+337. London: Macmillan, 1960. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Barns (J. W. B.), Ziliacius (H.)** The Antinopolis Papyri. Part ii. Pp. xi+133; 4 plates. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1961. Cloth and boards.
- Beckmann (F.)** Mensch und Welt in der Dichtung Vergils. (Orbis Antiquus, 1.) Zweite Auflage. Pp. 35. Münster: Aschendorff, 1960. Paper, DM. 2.40. [See C.R. lxxi. 229.]
- Bieler (L.)** Geschichte der römischen Literatur. Band i: Die Literatur der Republik. Pp. 760. Band ii: Die Literatur der Kaiserzeit. Pp. 133. (Sammlung Gösschen.) Berlin: De Gruyter, 1961. Paper, DM. 3.60 each.
- Biliski (B.)** L'agonistica sportiva nella Grecia antica: aspetti sociali e ispirazioni letterarie. Pp. 139. Rome: Signorelli, 1961. Paper.
- Boess (H.)** Procli Diadochi Tria Opuscula (De Providentia, Libertate, Malo) latine et graece. Pp. xxxi+349. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1959. Cloth, DM. 78.
- Bowers (C. M.)** Greek Lyric Poetry, from Alcman to Simonides. Second, revised edition. Pp. xii+444. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961. Cloth, 42s. net.
- Breitholtz (L.)** Die dorische Farce im griechischen Mutterland vor dem 5. Jahrhundert: Hypothese oder Realität. (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, x.) Pp. 259. Gothenburg: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1960. Paper, kr. 32.
- Briesmann (A.)** Tacitus und das flavische Geschichtsbild. (Hermes Einzelschriften, 10.) Pp. 105. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1955. Paper. (Received 1961.)
- Brasgrol-Remy (C.)** Ovide: Confidences et Recits. Expliqués et commentés. Pp. 62.

- Namur: Wesmael-Charlier, 1961. Paper, 35 B. fr.
- Carpenter (R.) Greek Sculpture. Pp. xiv+276; 47 plates. Chicago: University Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1961. Cloth, 56s. net.
- Carrière (J.) Stylistique grecque pratique. Pp. 236. Paris: Klincksieck, 1960. Paper, 14 fr.
- Casson (L.) Masters of Ancient Comedy. [Translations of *Acharnians*, *Dyskolos*, *Samia*, *Epitrepontes*, *Perikleistomenos*, *Mostellarius*, *Rudens*, *Phormio*, *Adelphi*.] Pp. xi+424. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1960. Cloth, \$5.95.
- Charles-Picard (G. and C.) Daily Life in Carthage at the time of Hannibal. Pp. 263. London: Allen and Unwin, 1961. Cloth, 28s. net.
- Claflì (V.) Petronio in Apuleio. Pp. 211. Turin: Università di Torino, Facoltà di Lettere, 1960. Paper, L. 1,300.
- Clay (D. M.) A Formal Analysis of the Vocabularies of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides. Part I. Pp. xxv+171. Minneapolis: privately printed (obtainable from the author, 310 Folwell Hall, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis), 1960. Paper, \$1.25.
- Clement (F.) Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans. Pp. xix+115. New York: Dover Publications, 1960. Stiff paper, \$1.35. [Reprint: first published 1912.]
- De Sanctis (G.) Storia dei Romani. vol. ii: La conquista del primato in Italia, Parte 2. Pp. xii+556. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1960. Paper, L. 6,000. [First published 1907.]
- Dörries (H.) Constantine and Religious Liberty. (Terry Lectures, 1958.) Pp. xi+141. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1960. Cloth, 32s. net.
- Driver (T. F.) The Sense of History in Greek and Shakespearean Drama. Pp. ix+231. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1960. Cloth, 40s. net.
- Elders (L.) Aristotle's Theory of the One. A commentary on book x of the *Metaphysics*. Pp. xviii+218. Assens, Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1961. Cloth, fl. 18.50.
- Everyman's Classical Atlas. New edition. With an essay on the development of ancient geographical knowledge and theory by J. O. Thomson. Pp. lxx+93. London: Dent, 1961. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Farquharson (A. S. L.) Marcus Aurelius: Meditations. Translated by A. S. L. F.; introduction by D. A. Rees. (Everyman's Library.) Pp. xviii+237. London: Dent, 1961. Cloth, 9s. 6d. net. [Reprint of the translation published with Farquharson's edition of 1944: see C.R. lix. 60.]
- Finley (M. I.) (ed.) Slavery in Classical Antiquity: Views and Controversies. Pp. vii+235. Cambridge: Heffer, 1960. Paper, 15s. net. [Reproductions of 11 articles from periodicals, with a bibliographical essay.]
- Fontenrose (J.) The Cult and Myth of Pyrrhos at Delphi. (Publications in Classical Archaeology, vol. 4, no. 3.) Pp. 76; 2 plates. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1960. Paper.
- Fränkel (H.) Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens. Zweite, aufgeweitete Auflage. Pp. xx+316. Munich: Beck, 1960. Cloth, DM. 28.
- Fraser (P. M.), Lehmann (K.) Samothrace. Excavations conducted by the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University. (Bollingen Series, ix.) Vol. 2, Part i: The Inscriptions on Stone. By P. M. F. Pp. xiii+163; 29 plates. Vol. 2, Part ii: The Inscriptions on Ceramics and Minor Objects. By K. L. Pp. x+154; 13 plates. New York: Pantheon Books, 1960. Cloth \$8.50 each.
- Frisk (H.) Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Lieferung 11. Pp. 96. Heidelberg: Winter, 1960. Paper, DM. 8.60.
- Grant (M. A.) The Myths of Hyginus. Pp. 244. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 1960. Cloth, \$4.
- Grenade (P.) Essai sur les origines du Principat. (Bibl. des Éc. Franç. d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. cxvii.) Pp. xvii+495. Paris: de Boccard, 1960. Paper.
- Hadas (M.) Humanism: the Greek Ideal and its Survival. Pp. xvi+132. London: Allen and Unwin, 1961. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Hilbtrunner (O.) Kleines Lexikon der Antike. Dritte, neu bearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. Pp. 563. Bern: Franke, 1961. Cloth, 14.80 Sw. fr.
- Holwerda (D.) Scholia in Aristophanem, pars iv: Jo. Tzetzae Commentarii. Fasc. ii: Commentarius in Nubes. Pp. 343. Groningen: Wolters, 1960. Cloth, fl. 75.
- Hooper (F. A.) Funerary Stelae from Kom Abou Billou. Pp. 154; 16 plates. Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, 1961. Paper, \$3.25 post free.
- Irmischer (J.), Kumaniecki (K.) Römische Literatur der augusteischen Zeit. Pp. vi+67. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960. Paper, DM. 9.80.
- King (N. Q.) 'There's such Divinity doth hedge a King.' Studies in ruler cult and the religion of sacral monarchy in some



- late fourth century Byzantine monuments. Pp. 34; 4 plates. Edinburgh: Nelson (for the University College of Ghana), 1960. Paper.
- Kirk (G. S.), Raven (J. E.) *The Presocratic Philosophers. A critical history with a selection of texts.* Pp. xii+487. Cambridge: University Press, 1961. Stiff paper, 25s. net. [Reprint: first published 1957 (see C.R. lxxiii. 119).]
- Klaffenbach (G.) *Bemerkungen zum griechischen Urkundenwesen.* (Sitz. d. deutschen Akad. zu Berlin, Kl. für Sprachen, Lit. u. Kunst, 1960. 6.) Pp. 42. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960. Paper, DM. 3.20.
- Kokolakis (M.) *Lucian and the Tragic Performances in his Time.* Pp. 45. Athens: privately printed, 1961. Paper.
- Kornemann (E.) *Tiberius.* Pp. 281; 2 plates. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960. Cloth, DM. 24.
- Körte (A.) *Die hellenistische Dichtung.* Zweite, vollständig neu bearbeitete Auflage von Paul Handel. Pp. vii+363. Stuttgart: Kröner, 1961. Cloth, DM. 11.
- Koyré (A.) *Discovering Plato.* Translated by L. C. Rosenfeld. Pp. x+118. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1961. Stiff paper, 8s. net. [First published 1945.]
- Kraner (F.), Dittenberger (W.) *Caesaris Commentarii de Bello Gallico.* 18te Auflage von H. Mensel; Nachwort und bibliografische Nachträge von H. Oppermann. Band iii. Pp. 234. Berlin: Weidmann, 1960. Cloth, DM. 18.
- Krischer (T.) *Das Problem der trilogischen Komposition und die dramaturgische Entwicklung der attischen Tragödie.* (Frankfurt diss.) Pp. 125. Privately printed, 1960: obtainable from Buchhandlung am Goethehaus, Am Salzhaus 3, Frankfurt am M. Paper, DM. 5.
- Lausberg (H.) *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft.* 2 vols. Pp. 957. Munich: Hueber, 1960. Cloth, DM. 54.
- Lord (A. B.) *The Singer of Tales.* Pp. xv+309. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1960. Cloth, 35s. net.
- Loyen (A.) *Sidoine Apollinaire. Tome i: Poèmes. Texte établi et traduit.* (Collection Budé.) Pp. lii+200 (mostly double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1960. Paper, 15 fr.
- Marastoni (A.) *P. Papini Stati Silvae.* (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. xciv+186. Leipzig: Teubner, 1961. Cloth, DM. 13.
- Marmorale* (E. V.) *Pertinenze e impertinenze.* Prima serie. Pp. 294. Naples: Armanni, 1960. Paper, L. 3,000.
- Marzullo (B.) *Studi di poesia colica.* Pp. xii+216. Florence: Le Monnier, 1958. Paper, L. 1,800.
- Mau (J.) *Galen: Einführung in die Logik. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar mit deutscher Übersetzung.* Pp. xii 69+27. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960. Paper, DM. 12.50.
- Moraux (P.) *Une défixion judiciaire au Musée d'Istanbul.* (Acad. Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres, Mémoires, liv. 2.) Pp. 62. Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1960. Paper, 50 B. fr.
- Morrow (G. R.) *Plato's Cretan City. A historical interpretation of the Laws.* Pp. xxii+623. Princeton: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1960. Cloth, 100s. net.
- Mugler (C.) *La physique de Platon.* (Études et Commentaires, xxxv.) Pp. 264. Paris: Klincksieck, 1960. Paper, 24 fr.
- Nilsson (M. P.) *Greek Folk Religion.* Pp. xviii+166; 40 ill. (Torchbooks, 78.) New York: Harper, 1961. Stiff paper, \$1.75. [Reprint: first published as Greek Popular Religion, Columbia University Press, 1940.]
- Nilsson (M. P.) *Opuscula Selecta.* Vol. iii. (Skr. utg. av Svenska Institutet i Athen, 8°, il. 3.) Pp. xii+574; 6 figs. Lund: Gleerup, 1961. Paper, kr. 65.
- Nisbet (R. G. M.) *Cicero: In Pisonem.* Edited with introduction and commentary. Pp. xxxii+208. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Novo (S.) *Ricerche sulle interpolazioni dei Memorabili di Senofonte.* (Univ. di Torino, Pubbl. della Fac. di Lett. e Fil., xii. 3.) Pp. 50. Turin: Università, 1960. Paper, L. 600.
- Nowak (H.) *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Begriffes Daimon. Eine Untersuchung epigraphischer Zeugnisse vom 5. Jh. v. Chr. bis zum 5. Jh. n. Chr.* Pp. 71. Bonn: privately printed, 1960. Paper.
- Olivier (J. P.) *A propos d'une 'liste' des desservants de sanctuaire dans les documents en lineaire B de Pylos.* Pp. vi+162 (typescript). Brussels: Presses Universitaires de Bruxelles, 1960. Paper, 180 B. fr.
- Pagrot (L.) *Den klassiska versatrens teori.* Debatten kring genren från Horatius t.o.m. 1700-talet. (Stockholm Studies in History of Literature, 5.) Pp. xvi+461. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1961. Paper, kr. 42. [90-page summary in English.]
- Pisani (V.) *Storia della lingua greca. Del Grande* (C.) *La metrica greca.* (Enciclopedia Classica, Sez. ii, vol. v.) Pp.



513. Turin: Società Internazionale Editrice, 1960. Cloth, L. 7,500.
- Pöhlmann (E.) Griechische Musikfragmente. Ein Weg zur altgriechischen Musik. (Erlanger Beiträge, viii.)* Pp. 84. Nuremberg: Hans Carl, 1960. Paper, DM. 12.50.
- Pouilloux (J.) Choix d'inscriptions grecques: textes, traductions et notes. (Bibl. de la Fac. des Lettres de Lyon, iv.)* Pp. 195. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1960. Paper, 10 fr.
- Prinz (O.) Itinerarium Egeriae (Peregrinatio Aetheriae). Fünfte, neuarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. (Sammlung Vulgarlateinischer Texte.)* Pp. xvi+63. Heidelberg: Winter, 1960. Paper, DM. 5.60.
- Questa (C.) Studi sulle fonti degli Annales di Tacito.* Pp. 215. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1961. Paper, L. 2,000.
- Roeses (R. C.) Tres Nations: Britannia, Gallia, Germania. A reader for the sixth or seventh term of Latin.* Pp. 80. Slough: Centaur Books, 1961. Limp cloth, 4s. 6d.
- Regenbogen (O.) Kleine Schriften.* Pp. viii+624. Munich: Beck, 1961. Cloth, DM. 98 (paper, DM. 32).
- Rostovtzeff (M.) Rome. (Galaxy Books.)* Pp. xiii+347; 23 plates. London: Oxford University Press, 1961. Stiff paper, 13s. 6d. net. [Published as vol. ii of *A History of the Ancient World, 1927-8.*]
- Schwartz (J.) Pseudo-Hésiodeia. Recherches sur la composition, la diffusion et la disparition ancienne d'œuvres attribuées à Hésiode.* Pp. 662. Leiden: Brill, 1960. Cloth, fl. 35.
- Smith (M.) The Ancient Greeks.* Pp. ix+144. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1960. Paper, 12s. net.
- Starr (C. G.) Roman Imperial Navy, 31 B.C. -A.D. 324. Second edition, with addenda.* Pp. xvii+232. Cambridge: Heffer, 1960. [First published 1941; see *C.R.* lv. 125.]
- Steckel (H.) Epikurs Prinzip der Einheit von Schmerzlosigkeit und Lust.* Pp. 198. Göttingen: privately printed, 1960.
- Susini (G.) Ricerche sulla Battaglia del Trasimeno.* Pp. 95. Cortona: Tipografia Commerciale, 1960. Paper.
- Taylor (A. E.) Plato: The Sophist and the Statesman. Translated with an introduction. Edited by R. Kilbanksy and E. Anscombe.* Pp. vii+344. Edinburgh: Nelson, 1961. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Taylor (L. R.) The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic. (Papers and Monographs, xx.)* Pp. xv+333; 3 maps. Rome: American Academy, 1960. Paper.
- Thevenot (E.) Les Éduens n'ont pas trahi. Essai sur les relations entre les Éduens et César au cours de la Guerre des Gaules et particulièrement au cours de la crise de 52. (Collection Latomus, I.)* Pp. 194; 6 plates. Brussels: Latomus, 1960. Paper, 300 B. fr.
- Thomson (G.) The Greek Language.* Pp. xv+101. Cambridge: Heffer, 1960. Paper, 15s. net.
- Tilly (B.) The Story of Pallas. (From Aeneid viii, x-xii.)* Pp. xxv+166. Cambridge: University Press, 1961. Boards, 7s. net.
- Tovar (A.) Euripides: Las Bacantes, Hécuba. Texto revisado y traducido. (Colección Hispánica.)* Pp. 166 (mostly double). Barcelona: Ediciones Alma Mater, 1960. Cloth.
- Trudennick (H.), Forster (E. S.) Aristotle; Posterior Analytics, Topics. With an English translation. (Loeb Classical Library.)* Pp. 755. London: Heinemann, 1961. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Walker (B.) The Annals of Tacitus. A Study in the writing of History. Second revised edition.* Pp. viii+284. Manchester: University Press, 1961. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Walsh (P. G.) Livy: his Historical Aims and Methods.* Pp. xi+301. Cambridge: University Press, 1961. Cloth, 40s. net.
- Webster (T. B. L.) Monuments illustrating Old and Middle Comedy. (Bulletin Supplement No. 9.)* Pp. viii+80; 6 plates. London: University of London Institute of Classical Studies, 1960. Paper, 20s. net.
- Weil (R.) Aristote et l'histoire: Essai sur la 'Politique'. (Études et Commentaires, xxxvi.)* Pp. 468. Paris: Klincksieck, 1960. Paper, 40 fr.
- Weische (A.) Cicero und die Neue Akademie. (Orbis Antiquus, 18.)* Pp. 111. Münster (Westf.): Aschendorff, 1961. Paper, DM. 9.80.
- Ziegler (K.) Plutarchus: Vitae Parallelae. Vol. i, fasc. 1. Tertium rec. K. Z. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.)* Pp. xxi+423. Leipzig: Teubner, 1961. Cloth, DM. 19.20.
- Zintzern (C.) Analytisches Hypomnema zu Senecas Phaedra. (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, 1.)* Pp. 145. Meisenheim (Glan): Anton Hain, 1961. Cloth, DM. 16.80.

THE HISTORY OF THE

... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...

... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...

... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...

... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...

... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...

... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...

... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...  
... of the ...

Continued from p. 2 of cover]

*degli Studi Classici* (Momigliano), P. A. BRUNT, 141; *The Greek State* (Ehrenberg), P. A. BRUNT, 149; *Hellenistic Culture* (Hadas), F. M. FRASER, 145; *Essai sur les magistratures des républiques étrusques* (Lambrecht), H. H. SCULLARD, 149; *Sources for Roman History, 133-70 B.C.* (Greenidge and Clay-Gray), H. H. SCULLARD, 150; *The Archive of Aurelius Iulianus* (Boak and Youtie), E. G. TURNER, 152; *Cretan Seals* (Kenna), F. H. STUBBINGS, 153; *Greek Painted Pottery* (Cook), T. D. L. WEBSTER, 154; *Gods and Men* (Parkes), H. J. ROSE, 156; *Orationes Oxonienses* (Higham), W. E. G. GUTHRIE, 157.

Short Reviews	158
Summaries of Periodicals	179
Correspondence	179
Books Received	180

## The Classical Association

The objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association. They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 30s., *Quarterly* 25s.; combined subscription £2. 13s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 20s.

Copies of the final issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (covering the years 1945-7) and of the volume for 1939-45 can still be obtained for 6s. each from Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, who can also supply many of the pre-war back numbers at 2s. 6d. per volume, post free.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mrs. Hooker, The University, Birmingham 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melluish, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northamptonshire, North Staffordshire, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales (Bangor), Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western (Exeter), Sussex, Swansea, Tees-side, Worcester and Malvern.

## *Aristotle: De Anima*

*Edited with Introduction and Commentary by*

SIR DAVID ROSS

Since the last commentary on the *De Anima* fifty-two years ago, there has been much discussion of the development of Aristotle's thought, the work of Jaeger and other scholars has made clearer the pattern of its development and much light has been thrown on its text by the publication of Förster's text, now hardly obtainable; publication of this new commentary therefore appears to be timely.

50s. net

## *Aristotle's System of the Physical World*

*A Comparison with his Predecessors*

FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN

This study of Aristotle's treatment of physical, cosmological, chemical, and meteorological questions assesses his debt to his precursors and defines the advance he made beyond them, and the specific nature of his own contribution to scientific thought.

60s. net

Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 33. Cornell University Press

## *Gifts in Contemplation of Death in Jewish and Roman Law*

REUBEN YARON

Jewish law concerning dispositions of property in contemplation of death, as it developed and became fixed during the Talmudic period (down to the sixth century A.D.) is examined and compared with other law of the period, particularly Roman. The treatment is historical, tracing change and development rather than seeking precedents, and finding parallels more often than influences in other contemporary law.

35s. net

*Oxford Classical Texts*

## *Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica*

*Edited by* HERMANN FRÄNKEL

The Greek text, with a preface and *apparatus criticus* in Latin. This will supersede the edition by R. C. Seaton.

21s. net

*Oxford Paperbacks*

## *The Greek Commonwealth*

*Politics and Economics in Fifth-Century Athens*

ALFRED ZIMMERN

10s. 6d. net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS



